

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WE are all familiar with Q, the initial letter of the German word for 'source', the name now generally applied to the hypothetical document from which the authors of the first and third Gospels are supposed to have drawn the 'teaching' of Jesus which they have in common. But what is X? The question is raised by the publication of the revised Gospels in the Century Bible, especially by Professor J. Vernon BARTLET'S *Mark*. In this edition the Synoptic Gospels are dissected, and the sections ticketed according to their supposed sources, in the manner with which we are more familiar in the Old Testament.

X has at least this advantage over Q that it suggests uncertainty. The editors are well aware that the Synoptic problem has by no means been finally solved. Professor BARTLET'S own book is a reminder that the question is not even so near solution as many had supposed. It seemed for a time as if Mark's Gospel and Q, the 'teaching' source, were rocks from which mariners in the troubled waters of New Testament criticism might take their bearings. But Professor BARTLET will have none of Q, at least if by that term we mean 'a body of traditional sayings of Jesus in a connected form, with some indeterminate historical element of introductory setting' existing 'in a single written form.'

Professor BARTLET does not deny that the first
VOL. XXXV.—No. 1.—OCTOBER 1923.

and third Gospels have drawn on a common 'sayings' source, but he maintains this source was neither fixed nor written. He attaches great importance to the common apostolic tradition, a tradition which would vary somewhat in different localities. Mark's Gospel, on his theory, is based fundamentally on this common apostolic type of tradition, 'in the form best known to Mark himself, in the main that used by Peter.' The other Synoptists used other local forms of this tradition, modified perhaps under the influence of other apostles. The symbol X, then, means this local and variable apostolic tradition, which was not primarily a collection of sayings.

Are the Pharisees caricatured in the Gospels? The 'heathen' are now taking very careful note of what the missionaries say about them and their religion, and similarly the Jews are examining their ancient records to try to show that in the Christian Gospels their forefathers were painted much blacker than they were. In the index to Professor BARTLET'S book the references both to Abrahams and to Montefiore have to take refuge in an 'etc.' How does Professor BARTLET deal with the criticism of aggrieved Jews?

In the first place he points out that the Mishna, on which, for example, Montefiore relies, in its written form dates from a century and a half after the

ministry of Jesus. By comparison the witness of the Synoptic Gospels is contemporary. Radical changes may take place in the religious outlook of a people in much less time than one hundred and fifty years, especially in the case of a people that has passed through heart-searching experiences. Further, it may very well be that in the conflict of the early Church with Pharisaic Judaism Jesus' criticism of the Pharisees became exaggerated in the transmission of the tradition both written and oral.

Yet there is no reason to doubt that the fundamental difference in religious attitude between Jesus and the Pharisees was the ultimate cause of the crucifixion, though the Sadducaic priests of Jerusalem may have been directly responsible. And there is one more thing to be said. Not the least of the victories of Jesus is that His prophetic conception of the Law is in our own day liberating the thoughts, the writings, and the piety of broad-minded Jewish scholars and synagogues.

Did Jesus see the end from the beginning? Professor BARTLET grants that Mark has no consciousness of any development in Jesus' conception of the nature of His ministry. Yet, without seeing their purport, Mark drops hints which seem to show that such a development took place. He narrates things clearly not expected by Jesus, things that move Him to 'surprise, disappointment, even indignation.' His filial consciousness was never dimmed, but after the first glad announcement of the coming of the Kingdom, He was reluctantly compelled to face the prospect of partial failure.

To begin with He felt and acted simply as the anointed prophet of His Father's will for Israel. But the hostility of the leaders, the irresponsiveness of the people, led Him to turn to the thought of the Servant of Jehovah, to see that the picture of the salvation of a stiff-necked people only through vicarious suffering was applicable to His ministry. The prophet's function expanded so as to include the priest's. A conflict issuing in His death and seeming defeat was inevitable. But after a brief interval,

on Hosea's 'third day,' God would intervene and raise up His own cause in His people Israel, and send again His Christ to restore all things.

Professor BARTLET has a characteristic reconstruction and elucidation of the story of the Transfiguration. The reconstruction he acknowledges to be in part speculative. Matthew and Mark conceive the disciples as sharing the vision with Jesus. But Luke, adhering to his special source, gives an account which, except in one point, is consistent with the idea that the vision was for Jesus only. The one point is that he represents the disciples as actually seeing Moses and Elijah, but that feature may have been an excrescence on the tradition growing out of Peter's half-dazed comment.

Why was it Moses and Elijah that Jesus saw? The strong recoil of the disciples' minds from the idea of the rejection of Jesus had reawakened the conflict in His own mind. As Jesus wrestled in prayer with the enigma of His destiny, final victory came to Him in the assurance that rejection was God's destined way. So had it been in the picture of the Isaianic Servant. So had it been, though less obviously, in the case of Israel's great deliverer, Moses. This was the lesson that Stephen found in the career of Moses. The Moses who delivered His people was the Moses who had been rejected by them (Ac 7³⁵).

This is not simply clever conjecture; for the author of the Assumption of Moses, written just before Jesus' day, speaks of 'what Moses suffered' in Egypt, and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness during forty years. In the case of Elijah also, that it was his sufferings on which the mind of Jesus was dwelling seems clear from the conversation as they descended the hill. 'Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him.'

Of the revised Gospels in the Century Bible, the editions of Luke and John are revisions of the former

issues, those of Matthew and Mark are for all practical purposes new books. Among the four volumes there is a marked difference in the point of view. It is well that it should be so, as otherwise the impression would be given that the unanimity on disputed questions is greater than it is.

Take a test case. The Gospels seem to record three cases of raising from the dead. What have the four editors to say about them? We turn first to the story of Lazarus in the Fourth Gospel. Dr. McClymont leaves unaltered his former statement. This story is neither a mythical nor a legendary growth; nor is it an allegory or fiction invented by the writer to illustrate the doctrine of the Logos, nor is it the story of Dives and Lazarus turned into a miracle. The raising of Lazarus as an historic fact was the culmination of the Saviour's ministry.

The late Principal ADENEY, who writes on Luke, contents himself with simply expounding the story of the widow's son of Nain. On Jairus' daughter he is non-committal. 'She is not dead, but sleepeth' might be intended literally, but more probably Jesus was rebuking the hopeless conception of death. Professor Box on Matthew writes that in the account in Matthew and in Mark there is nothing inconsistent with the view that the girl was in a swoon (though Matthew v.¹⁸ has to be reckoned with). He acknowledges, however, that Luke thought the girl was dead.

Professor BARTLET shows his characteristic courage and caution. He notes that Professor Menzies thinks the general effect of Mark is that Jesus acted throughout as if the child were not dead. Luke adds details to make it clear that in his judgment the child was dead. Dr. BARTLET thinks the truth lies between the two. Probably Mark took quite literally the words of Jesus—'The child is not dead, but sleepeth.' The general impression of the whole incident is that Jesus went forward in full faith in His Father's gracious will, to do that which the facts of the case demanded—

'whether to heal or to bind up the broken-hearted with words of faith and undying hope in God as Father.'

Much has of late been written on the religious uniqueness of Israel, and with most of it every student of Comparative Religion, indeed every one with even a smattering of history, will be constrained to agree. Israel has presented the world with a conception of God more entirely satisfying than that of any other people, and with a Personality who has no peer among the sons of men. The Jew has left a deep and abiding mark upon the religious language and life of the world.

It comes, therefore, upon us with a shock of surprise to be told by the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., in his recently published volume on *The Sacred Dance* (Cambridge University Press; 8s. 6d. net), that 'the religious uniqueness of the Israelites, as a nation, has been, and often still is, exaggerated to an undue extent.' Yet Dr. OESTERLEY is right. 'The nation as a whole,' he says, 'was for many centuries no better and no worse than others.'

The truth is that, when we speak of the uniqueness of Israel, we are really thinking of the uniqueness of her great men, notably of the prophets. Doubtless the nation did later—especially after the Exile—rise to a position of 'isolated superiority.' But this national achievement was really and ultimately due to the mighty personalities of the prophets who, controlled and guided by the Divine Spirit, developed inherited conceptions of God into a religion which, for ethical power and purity, had no equal in the ancient world. Speaking generally, it is not so much the people of Israel as her spiritual aristocracy that comes to utterance in the Old Testament.

More or less is this true of all literature, and very particularly of ancient literature. It is the voice of the aristocracy, intellectual or spiritual, that we hear in it. Time sifts, and, on the whole, it is the best that survives. No one supposes that every Greek epic poet was as good as Homer, or every

statesman as good as Pericles, or every historian as good as Thucydides, or every dramatist as good as Æschylus, or every philosopher as good as Plato. These men were head and shoulders above the people, the intellectual aristocrats of their nation.

Of course these men, like all men, were rooted in national soil, and had much, very much, in common with their contemporaries. Homer is universal, but he is first of all Greek; Shakespeare is universal, but he is first of all English; Burns is universal, but he is first of all Scottish. All the same, these men are giants, and the average of national attainment cannot fairly be inferred from them.

This is more than usually true of the great men of Israel. It is not only that they tower above their contemporaries in ethical insight and passion, but that they challenge those contemporaries, they oppose them, they threaten them, they wage implacable war upon their ethical conceptions and behaviour. Amos declares that their defiance of the moral order will bring upon them an inescapable doom. Hosea finds that there is no fidelity, nor love, nor knowledge of God in the land. Isaiah announces that their callous indifference to the prophetic word is so complete that it can only be adequately punished by the utter desolation of the land. Jeremiah sorrowfully complains that there is not a man in all Jerusalem who does justice and seeks truth. And Ezekiel fiercely challenges the whole history of his people as a continuous exhibition of unadulterated paganism.

In the face of these prophetic criticisms, it is easier to say that the prophets were unique men than that pre-exilic Israel was a unique people. The pages of the historians, too, reflect the same lamentable and unremitting apostasies as the speeches of the prophets. There Israel is described as a stiff-necked people, walking in the way of the heathen, working wicked things to provoke the Lord to anger, and richly deserving the doom which ultimately fell upon them. There is a measure of truth in the unlovely picture of Israel drawn by the

caustic pen of Friedrich Delitzsch in his deplorably one-sided book 'Die grosse Täuschung'; prophets and historians alike are witness to that. Even in the century after the Exile, when one might have supposed that the question of monotheism was settled for ever, we find Egyptian Jews frankly recognizing other gods than Jahweh and worshipping them alongside of, and in association with, Him.

All this only enhances our appreciation of the uniqueness of the prophets. It is very clear that they were not the creatures of their environment. Rather were they its sharpest critics, and assuredly not from it did they derive their message. The word that they uttered, while in a profound sense their own, was in a yet profounder sense not their own: it was the word that the Lord had given them to utter. They spoke because they could do no other; because, as one of them put it, the Lord had revealed His secret to His servants the prophets. The message that for centuries they had so persistently reiterated, corroborated as it was by the stern facts of history, did at length sink into the national heart and conscience, and Israel became, and to this day has remained, a unique people.

Yet even in earlier religious usages there are glimpses of this religious superiority of the Hebrews, which is so resplendent in the prophets. Dr. OESTERLEY closes his discussion of the Ecstatic Dance with these impressive words: 'Reviewing the subject as a whole, there is no doubt that Hebrew and Greek practice here illustrates their religious superiority over all the other races. But of these two the Hebrews stand on distinctly higher ground; there is not the remotest reason for believing that the ecstatic dance among them was ever contaminated by the licence which often obtained among the Greeks. Even in the lower planes of religious thought and practice the Hebrews showed that they were in the vanguard of religious evolution.'

Dr. OESTERLEY's book on *The Sacred Dance*, from which the preceding quotation is taken, is a

solid contribution to a little known department of Folk-lore. He covers, as every folk-lorist must, a wide territory in his search for relevant facts. He brings before us nations, ancient and modern, cultured and uncultured—Hittites, Babylonians, Assyrians, Syrians, Hebrews, Arabs, Greeks, Romans, North American Indians, Malays, Polynesians, and others. But perhaps it would not be unfair to say that his real, at any rate his dominating, interest is the elucidation of the Old Testament. He is first of all an Old Testament scholar; and partly for this reason 'the Old Testament figures somewhat prominently' in his pages, and partly also because in that ancient Hebrew literature most of the various types of sacred dance are to be found, either directly or—as he pretty convincingly shows—by implication.

Dancing and theology may seem a rather ill-assorted pair. But dancing has been a very vital element in religion—'there was scarcely ever worship among the Greeks without song and dance'—and part of the interest of Dr. OESTERLEY'S discussion is that he endeavours to pierce behind the religious usage to the theology, or 'savage philosophy,' as he sometimes calls it, underlying it. Many side-lights may be thrown upon the practices of Hebrew and other civilized religions by the analogous practices of uncultured peoples; and many a post-Biblical usage is rooted, we may be sure, in customs of immemorial antiquity which, for various reasons, have received no explicit mention in the Old Testament. Later editors, for example, would be likely to suppress allusions to customs which were manifestly incompatible with Jahweh worship.

The types of sacred dance with which Dr. OESTERLEY deals are eight: the sacred processional dance, the encircling of a sacred object, the ecstatic dance, the dance at vintage or harvest festivals, the dance in celebration of victory, the sacred dance as a circumcision rite, as a marriage rite, and as a burial or mourning rite. All these dances either demonstrably existed, or may be reasonably inferred to

have existed, among the Hebrews; and of course they are found throughout the world. It is amusing to read that among the Namaquas, when any one embraces Christianity, it is said that 'he has given up dancing.'

The firmly rooted place of dancing in ancient Semitic life and religion is attested by the astonishingly large number of words to denote it; and it assumed many forms, from simple leaping to the curious limping dance of the Phœnician Baal priests on Carmel, and even to dances involving violent contortions of the body. The amended text of Hos 7¹⁴ shows that some, at any rate, of the Hebrews lacerated their bodies, like the Phœnician prophets in 1 K 18²⁸, by way of appealing to the deity on behalf of their corn and vines.

To Biblical students probably the most interesting parts of the discussion will be the chapters on the Marriage Dance and Ecstatic Dance. It has long been recognized that the dance which the bride in the Song 6¹³ is invited to execute is a war-dance. But why a war-dance? One theory is that the sword she carries and brandishes during her dance is intended to 'symbolize and proclaim the fact that she is prepared to defend herself from all unlawful approach of other suitors.' Others believe that it is a relic of the ancient custom of marriage by capture. To both views there are valid objections; and Dr. OESTERLEY hazards the interesting suggestion that 'the sword-dance is a relic of the custom of warding off what were supposed to be invisible foes who gather around at the time of marriages.'

In this connexion he makes another equally interesting suggestion. It is well known that dancing was believed to be a means of ensuring fertility: high leaps were supposed to have the effect of making the corn grow high. The uncultured man believes that he can put into motion the working of Nature by means of his own devising. So, argues the writer, 'if he induce or assist the spirits of fertility in producing corn and buffaloes, there is no reason

why he should not by the same means assist them in quickening the child-bearing capacity of a woman.'

Of the Ecstatic Dance there seem to have been two forms, one of which had for its purpose the forcing of the deity to answer prayer. In this, self-laceration takes place, illustrated by the prophets of Baal, who cut themselves with knives and lancets till the blood gushed out upon them. In this case the loss of consciousness does not necessarily ensue. But the more familiar type is that which had for its object union with the deity. This union is secured by the dance, which continues, with ever-increasing violence, till a state of semi-consciousness or total unconsciousness supervenes, which makes it possible for the deity to take up his abode in the body of the worshipper. Then the man is 'possessed.'

It is at this point that the superiority of the Hebrew religion is most strikingly in evidence. Among the Hebrews, Dr. OESTERLEY reminds us, 'it is the milder type that is indigenous; it is a means of receiving the spirit of Jahweh, and this for the practical purpose of divining His will and proclaiming it. The object of it was purely devotional; and when an oracle was put forth it was only to declare the will of their God.' It is here that the literary prophets stand pre-eminent. 'They rose to the higher belief that *this* means was not necessary for achieving the purpose for which it was used. It had served a useful purpose; but having served its purpose it was dropped. The prophets came to the realization that there were more spiritual means whereby union with the deity was brought about; then the sacred dance found no further place among them.'

To the student of primitive religion in general, and of ancient Hebrew religion in particular, this able and well-documented book has much to offer.

In a recent number of the *New Statesman* there is a striking article on 'The American Religious

Crisis' which is of more than passing interest. It deals with the remarkable outbreak of theological and critical conservatism which is a feature of present-day American Church life. At three different centres 'incidents' have occurred which have aroused deep feeling and occasional fierce conflict that may have decisive results in the near future.

The best-known case is that of Dr. FOSDICK. He is a Baptist minister, known in this country by his excellent little book on prayer and other books on similar lines. He has been lent to a noted Presbyterian Church in New York on account of his preaching gifts, and has for long been attracting large congregations there. To those who know him from his books his teaching seems not only positive but intensely evangelical. This, however, has not saved him from prosecution on account of his 'modern' critical views, and at the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church his teaching was condemned and a resolution was passed by a majority committing that Church to the most literal acceptance of the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture.

At the same time two other 'cases' emerged. In New York a popular Episcopalian clergyman expressed views more radical a great deal than Dr. FOSDICK's, and, when taken to task by his bishop, openly defied him. And then again, in the Middle West and in the Methodist Episcopal Church, still another heretic has been disturbing the waters of orthodoxy in very much the same fashion.

All this seems more like a widespread outbreak of heresy than of orthodoxy. But the remarkable thing is the strength of the movement that has emerged in answer to the heretics. It carried the Assembly of Presbyterianism and it has swept over America like a prairie fire. And, what is more remarkable still, the same intense and aggressive conservatism has shown itself recently in England. It has caused a serious fissure in one of the great missionary societies and reveals its earnestness in

a propaganda that has a powerful financial backing.

What is the explanation of this sudden and widespread movement? The writer in the *New Statesman* analyzes the situation with obvious local knowledge of American conditions. He gives two reasons. One is a post-war fear of revolutionary influences. The real force of war feeling is only now being felt and to it every radical of every kind is a Bolshevik. This is as true in the religious sphere as in others.

The other reason is to be found in the conditions of Church life in America. 'Fundamentalism,' as the conservative movement is called, has little hold in the big cities. But the great mass of American Church members, the writer says, are to be found in outlying farms and holdings away from the centres of culture. These people know nothing of the modern critical attitude, or indeed of modernism in religion of any kind. They are acquainted only with the old ways and the old creed and will have nothing to do with any other.

Professor B. W. BACON, of Yale, himself a 'higher critic' but also a warm evangelical, goes deeper in a recent lecture delivered to American students. He thinks 'Fundamentalism' is at its root a protest against the barren 'liberalism' which has no gospel and no positive word to say about Christ, the kind of liberalism which has been associated with the name of Germany. As such,

'Fundamentalism' at heart arises from loyalty to the gospel, and for that reason Professor BACON has a deep sympathy with it.

His contention is that those who have absorbed the newer knowledge and the critical standpoint ought to show that these are not inconsistent with warm evangelical zeal and positive faith in a supernatural Christ. That, he thinks, is the task of the evangelical critics in the near future. What the Church needs is education, and education in the truer view of Scripture by men who believe in it and also believe heartily in the Gospel of Grace revealed in the New Testament. There can be no going back from truth, but the urgent necessity of the hour is to show beyond any reasonable doubt that the truth gained by criticism is not a menace to faith but a help and a buttress to it.

The Church awaits revival and needs nothing so much. It is true, revived life will only come from the preaching of a living Saviour. But it will not come until the mass of church-going people have their belief in the Bible restored to them. Great numbers who know little of the results of criticism know at least that it has discredited the old view of inspiration. And this vague impression means loss of confidence in the Word. The old view will never be given back to these people, because it is not true. What they need is a positive view of Scripture as the Word of God that has a sound basis in truth. When that faith is built up by the Church in its members revival will come.

The Origin of a Famous Lucan Gloss.

BY RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., MANCHESTER.

WHEN Cureton published in 1858, from a Nitrian MS. of the fifth century, what he described as the *Remains of a very ancient recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, hitherto unknown in Europe*, it was soon recognized that a text of the Gospels had been recovered, which was of an earlier type than

that which was current in the much admired and venerated Syriac Vulgate. The more its superior antiquity was established, the more important was the duty laid on New Testament critics of analysing the variations of the new text from the popular Syriac tradition, and of determining, where possible,

the causes which underlay the variation of the texts. This was imperative in the cases where the new text differed by notable excesses or defects from the old, and the problems thus presented are, for the most part, still with us; the omissions not all justified, the insertions not all explained. Amongst the insertions, or glosses (we use the word without prejudice), one of the most striking was an expansion in Lk 23⁴⁸, which runs as follows in Cureton's text:

'And all those which were assembled there, and saw that which was done, were smiting upon their breast, and saying, Woe to us, What is this! Woe to us from our sins.'

The question before us is the determination of the origin of the words which have here been substituted for the conventional ending, 'returned.' May we restore the passage, or should we delete it? The first thing to remark is that Cureton has mistranslated the Syriac; he should have said, 'Woe to us! What has befallen us?' but he did not recognize that the verb 'to be' in the sense which we have here given, 'what has happened,' can be read with an accusative in Syriac. The correction will be seen, presently, to be of importance in the judgment of the text.

We may take the next stage in the study of the gloss from the eighth edition of Tischendorf's NT, in which the Cureton readings were inserted, Tischendorf himself advising us in the preface that the new text was of the middle of the second century, and its rival, whom it was to displace, of the end of the second century. We know, now, that this was two hundred years too soon for the publication of the Peshitta, and that it was probably some decades too soon for the Curetonian text. That is a matter of slight importance; but the case is different when Tischendorf quotes the gloss in the form (omitting ὑπέστρεφον): 'et dicentes: Vae nobis, quae facta sunt; vae nobis propter peccata nostra,' where he should have said, 'quod factum est nobis.' Tischendorf then makes the important reference to the Latin Codex of St. Germain (which he denotes by the sign g¹), as containing the Syriac gloss in a longer form, thus: 'dicentes: Vae nobis, quae facta sunt hodie propter peccata nostra; appropinquavit desolatio Hierusalem'; the MS. reads *uobis* and *hodiae*, but that is unimportant: the thing to notice is the expanded form in which the gloss occurs.

The evidence now accumulates from various un-

expected quarters for one form or another of the gloss. When I wrote in 1890 my little tract on the *Diatessaron of Tatian* I was able to point to two documents, of Syriac origin, which showed traces of the gloss before us. Both of them were dependent upon the lost *Diatessaron*, and it was, therefore, highly probable that the gloss itself was a part of the text of Tatian. The first document in question is the *Doctrine of Addai*, where we read as follows:

'Unless those who crucified Him had known that He was the Son of God, they would not have had to proclaim the desolation of their city, nor would they have brought down Woe! upon themselves' (*Addai*, c. 27).

The passage is a harmonistic rendering, in that it has the Matthaean 'Son of God' instead of the Lucan 'righteous man'; and we should also observe that the persons who cry out 'Woe' are not the crowds who had gathered to the sight, but in a special sense, the Crucifiers. Moreover, in the *Diatessaron*, as known to the author of *Addai*, there stood a reference to the desolation of Jerusalem, as we observed in the St. Germain MS.

The other authority is the now well-known Commentary of Ephrem on the *Diatessaron*, preserved in an Armenian translation: the following passages are significant:

P. 245. 'Their mind began, little by little, to be illuminated. "Woe was it; Woe was it to us; this was the Son of God."'

P. 246. 'When, however, the natural sun had failed them, then by the very darkness it became clear to them that the destruction of their city had arrived. "The judgments," it says, "of the ruin of Jerusalem have come."' And so because this city did not receive Him who had builded it, it remained for it, that it should see its own ruin. Here we notice again a certain parallelism with the gloss as it occurs in the St. Germain MS. There is the triple reference to the ruin of the city. We notice also that there must have been in the text of Ephrem some reference to seeing or not seeing what was occurring; for he plays on the effect of the miraculous darkness on the eyes of the spectators, and says that they did not see and yet saw.

We may also find a further slight allusion on Ephrem's part: on p. 248, 'The first utterance in their mouth was one of mockery . . . the second was Woe in their mouth, accompanied by beating on their breasts.'

We claimed, then, the Cureton gloss, in an expanded form, for the *Diatessaron*; and we may admit (*horresco referens*) that we followed Cureton in his mistranslation.

At this point we might have added (if we had known it) a passage from a very early discourse attributed to Marutha of Maiferkat in the fourth century, which runs as follows:

'Woe to us! what happened to us! Our eyes saw the slaughter of the saints, but (yet) they did not see it, because of our insolence' (Bedjan, *Acta Sanctorum*, ii. p. 58). Here we have again a trace of the Cureton gloss, together with a suggestion of misfortunes seen and yet not seen.

The next accretion to the evidence is from the Greek quarter. In 1892 a fragment of the lost Gospel of Peter was found in a tomb at Akhmim in Upper Egypt; it contained a large part of the story of the Passion, and in particular it reported that 'the Jews and the elders and the priests, recognizing what ill they had done to themselves, began to wail and to say, Woe to our sins; the judgment and the end of Jerusalem hath drawn nigh!'

The importance of this new text was evident: on the one hand, it agreed closely with the St. Germain Latin in its reference to the approach of the judgment of Jerusalem; on the other hand, this is very nearly what we had in the text of Ephrem about the 'arrival of the judgments of the ruin of Jerusalem.' So we were now face to face with Greek evidence for our gloss, which could hardly be dated later than the second century.

Last of all we have Mrs. Lewis' Syriac Gospel from Mt. Sinai, a text certainly older than that of Cureton, but in exact agreement with it as far as the gloss is concerned. We come now to the question as to the origin of this widely attested gloss, and as to the meaning of this common matter in the *Gospel of Peter* and in the *Diatessaron of Tatian*. Dr. Swete attacked the problem in his edition of the *Gospel of Peter* with much confidence. 'The genesis of the passage,' says he, 'can hardly be doubtful! The people wailed; wailing expresses itself in cries of Woe. The next step would be to add the words ἡγγισεν ἡ κρίσις or ἡ ἐρήμωσις or τὸ τέλος Ἱερουσαλήμ, or some combination of them founded on Dn 2²⁶ or on Lk 21²⁰.' The criticism, though confident, can hardly be called convincing.

Professor Burkitt was more cautious: in his note on the passage in Luke, he corrects the mistransla-

tions, draws attention to the parallelism between *St. Peter* and the *Diatessaron*, and says that 'this sentence (from *Peter*) and the form of text found in the *Diatessaron* obviously have a common origin: possibly the Gospel of Peter is the original source of the reading!' This would add a fifth Gospel to the structure of the *Diatessaron*. Burkitt was also quite clear that 'some reference to the "judgment" or "desolation" of Jerusalem stood in the *Diatessaron* as well as the cry, "Woe to us! what hath befallen us?"'

Dr. Swete had expressed himself in favour of the opposite opinion, that the *Gospel of Peter* was dependent on the *Diatessaron*. He found traces of harmonization in Peter, relatively to the canonical Gospels, and expressed himself as follows (*Intro.* xxv.):

'We may perhaps claim to have established a strong presumption that the Petrine writer employed a harmony which in its general selection of extracts, and in some of its minuter arrangements, very nearly resembled the *Harmony of Tatian*. . . . The relation of the Petrine writer to Tatian remains for the present an open question; but enough has been said to render such a relation probable if further inquiries should lead us to place the *Gospel of Peter* after the publication of the *Diatessaron*.' We may take it that Dr. Swete's suggestion of further inquiries will include a further research into the actual origin of the gloss which we are discussing. Suppose that we turn once more to the Syriac literature in search of illumination.

Among the earliest deposits of that literature will be found the account of the martyrdoms which took place in Persia under Sapor. The MS. accounts of this great persecution go back to the fifth century, the persecution itself to the middle of the fourth century. The principal figure among the Christian sufferers was Simeon bar Sabba'e, and his tale will be found in the second volume of the *Patrologia Syriaca*. The author of these *Acts of Martyrdom* begins by historical parallels with the sufferings of the Maccabees, and in the course of his reminiscence he relates as follows:

'Mattathias sighed and said: *Woe to us! what has befallen us! to look upon the misery of our people, and upon the ruin of the holy city and His temple which is given into the hands of the aliens: and behold! our glory and our beauty is devastated. Why do we yet live?*'

It will be admitted that we have here a striking parallel to our evangelical gloss: so we must examine the passage a little closer. The writer is quoting from the second chapter of the First Book of Maccabees. That is certain; but it is also clear that in that case we have a fragment of the earliest Syriac text of Maccabees that is known to us. It is an earlier text than the printed Vulgate Syriac, and somewhat earlier than the great Milan text of the sixth century: the latter runs as follows:

‘And he saw the blasphemies that were done in Judah and Jerusalem, and he said: Woe to me! why has it befallen me to look upon the misery of my people, and upon the ruin of the holy city? and they sat there, while it was delivered into the hand of the enemies and into the hand of the aliens . . . and behold! our sanctuary and our beauty and our glory is devastated.’

We have, then, in the *Martyrdom of Simeon bar Sabba'e*, an extract from a very early Syriac text of 1 Mac., and this extract supplies us with so many coincidences with what we have in the gloss on Luke, that we may conclude the latter to be dependent on the former. Here is the ‘Woe’ in its archaic form, and here the references to the devastation of Jerusalem. Here also is the clue to the references in Ephrem and in Marutha to the seeing what was being done or to be done to the Holy City and the Holy Place. The glossator has drawn upon this passage in the Maccabees, and has expanded it by a reference to the sins of the people, ‘Woe to us for our sins!’

The next thing that is clear is that the gloss cannot have come from the Greek text of 1 Mac. It is the Syriac text that is being quoted in the *Martyrdom*, and it is with this Syriac text that the authors quoted show coincidence. The Greek text begins οἱμοι, ἵνα τί τοῦτο ἐγενήθη, which will not furnish the requisite matter either to the *Peter Gospel* or to the *Diatessaron*.

It will also be regarded as fairly certain that, in spite of the antiquity of its attestation, the gloss can hardly be allowed as a part of the primitive text. The evidence that we have brought forward shows that it was imported into the *Diatessaron* from a Syriac text. It seems probable, also, that the *Gospel of Peter* is—as Swete suggested, under the influence of the *Diatessaron*, and that the St. Germain MS. is in the same condemnation. We now apply to all the Biblical texts that are involved in the inquiry the rule that ‘when the cause of a variant is known, the variant itself disappears.’ We began our inquiry with an historical sequence of related texts that had come to light, beginning with the reading of the Cureton text. It has, however, come out in the course of that inquiry, that the involved reading of the *Diatessaron* must have been a good deal longer than that in the Old Syriac Gospel. There was more of Maccabees in it. The play which Ephrem makes over the ‘seeing’ the destruction of Jerusalem, takes us back to the passage in Maccabees, which in the existing Greek speaks of ‘seeing the devastations of my people and the devastation of the holy city.’ It is interesting to note that Ephrem keeps up the play on this for paragraph after paragraph. ‘The city was to see its own ruin. But in future the Jews would not be able to see it.’ In fact they are now prohibited from seeing it: or they ‘could only see it widowed and destroyed.’ The recurrences show that, as we pointed out, Ephrem’s *Diatessaron* had more in it (from the Maccabees) than the old Syriac can now show.

Enough has now been said by way of clearing the text of the NT (or at least its critical apparatus) of one more encumbrance. In this direction every simplification is a distinct gain. It is also an advantage to know that the text of the First Book of Maccabees was probably extant in Syriac at a very early period.

Literature.

THE CENTURY BIBLE.

PROFESSOR A. C. BRADLEY once remarked that the period during which an English Dictionary is authoritative is about ten years. The late Principal Adeney apparently estimated the duration

of the validity of a Commentary on the Gospels at twenty years. At least that is about the time that has elapsed since the Gospels were first published in *The Century Bible*, and we now have a new edition, to which we accord a hearty welcome.

The Century Bible, revised edition: *Matthew*, ed.

by Professor G. H. Box, M.A., D.D.; *Mark*, by Professor J. Vernon Bartlet, M.A., D.D.; *Luke*, by the late Principal W. F. Adeney, M.A., D.D.; *John*, by the Very Rev. J. A. McClymont, C.B.E., D.D. (Jack; 3s. 6d. net per volume).

One commendable change is the omission of the 1611 version. It may with safety be assumed that the so-called 'authorized' version is in the hands of all who are sufficiently interested in the Gospels to read a commentary on them. This omission brings the new commentaries into line with the Old Testament volumes in the same series, and leaves valuable space available for new material.

Another innovation is the insertion in the margin of the Synoptic Gospels of symbols indicative of the source from which each section is believed to be derived. This change has also the precedent of the historical books of the Old Testament in the Century Bible. The experiment was perhaps worth making, though the difficulties that beset it are well known to the editors.

The edition of *Matthew*, edited by Professor Box, is a new book edited by a fine and reverent scholar. It is a worthy opening volume of the revised New Testament section of this important series. The editor allows a large place to 'miracle,' but treats each narrative on its merits. When he favours conservative views, as on the whole he tends to do, it is because they commend themselves to the mature judgment of one who knows what is to be said on the other side. Thus he accepts the Virgin Birth, but is doubtful about Jesus walking on the sea, and suspects that the story of Peter walking on the sea is a kind of Christian midrash. Like Professor Bartlet he has his quarrel with Mr. Montefiore.

Professor J. Vernon Bartlet's volume on *Mark* is also for all practical purposes a new book. Even where he follows Principal Salmond's earlier commentary most closely, he never simply reproduces it; everywhere there is careful emendation. Like Professor Box he has spared no pains to make his readers acquainted with the present position of New Testament scholarship on his subject. He writes with knowledge, reverence, and just the proper degree of disregard for the supposed susceptibilities of his readers. He takes us into his confidence, and when he finds himself unable to accept the Gospel narratives as they stand, tries to explain how the facts clothed themselves in their present form. We believe that Professor Vernon

Bartlet has rightly judged the state of mind of a large section of the reading public, who are no longer content with pious reflexions even on the sacred narrative, but want to know the how and the why. The insight, the scholarship, the patient industry, and the independent judgment revealed in this volume make it a real addition to our literature on *Mark*.

Luke is edited, as in the earlier edition, by Principal Adeney, who was the General Editor of the series. In the Introduction, the sections on Composition and on Date have been rewritten. The earlier commentary, apart from some corrections, seems to have been generally retained. Principal Adeney belonged to the conservative section of those who adopt critical methods, and frequently contented himself with expounding the text of a passage which to others would suggest difficult problems. His point of view is indicated in the first of two new appendices, that on the Virgin Birth. He gives a fine and just summary of the arguments on both sides, a summary which furnishes no dogmatic conclusion. He acknowledges that apart from the Infancy narratives in *Matthew* and *Luke* the Virgin Birth is never mentioned in the New Testament. It is nowhere used as a proof of the Divinity of Jesus or as an explanation of His sinlessness. Therefore, says Principal Adeney, the burden of proof lies with those who suggest that vv.^{34, 35} of *Lk* 1 are an interpolation. This is at least clever.

The *Fourth Gospel* is edited, as in the earlier edition, by Dr. McClymont. There is much new material in the Introduction, but the commentary seems to follow the earlier commentary very closely. On the whole he accepts the authorship of John the Apostle, while allowing for the possibilities of later revision, and leaving open the question how far the writer's individuality has influenced his reproduction of the words and actions of the Master.

THE CLOISTERERS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

'If history,' says Mr. C. G. Coulton on p. 185 of vol. i. of *Five Centuries of Religion* (Cambridge University Press; 30s. net), 'is to have any real value for the world, it must strive to get down to those realities in which all readers are interested; for the old religious problems, amid

all changes of name and circumstance, are eternally with us.' For the period with which this volume deals, whose sub-title is 'St. Bernard, his Predecessors and Successors, 1000-1200 A.D.,' Mr. Coulton 'gets down to those realities' with conspicuous success and with a superabundance of detail which he commands with complete mastery and enables his readers to estimate with ease, as his quotations from mediæval sources, which are often lengthy, are practically always translated.

His aim, he tells us, is 'to describe, however summarily, the life and work of those myriads of nameless cloisterers who were so naturally dominant in the Middle Ages, and by whose own choice it has come about, if indeed man is in any sense master of his own and others' fate, that their successors count for so little in the world around us.' In a book adorned with many beautiful illustrations he deals in a truly fascinating way with the life and belief of the monks and of the Middle Ages generally, elaborately discussing topics of such commanding interest as The Rise of Monasticism, Hell and Purgatory, The Mass, The Mother of God, The Gospel of Mary, A Novice's Soul, The Eternal Feminine, etc. Like a true historian he seeks to offer a faithful picture, neither all light nor all shadow; but what he says of the age of Benedict and Gregory, that 'much of current Christianity was merely paganism veneered,' was true more or less of the whole period. Indeed, the same thing could be said with some justice of 'much of the current Christianity' of to-day.

The sections dealing with Mary are of peculiar interest. True, there were some who 'neglected or depreciated or even doubted' her transcendent glories, but in the main she held a place of incomparable esteem and devotion, and 'played a greater part than any Greek or Roman goddess ever played.' For practical purposes her protection was more important than Christ's own, and her cult did something to humanize a creed which, 'in the hands of formal theologians and dialecticians, had grown too inhuman.'

Another very interesting section is the discussion of The Mass, a discussion on which Mr. Coulton confesses that he enters with reluctance, as it is difficult to do complete justice to a doctrine on which Catholic and Protestant hold such passionately divergent opinions. Mr. Belloc, we are reminded, took Mr. Wells to task for his omission of the Eucharist in his sketch of European history ;

but Mr. Coulton very properly points out that 'Mr. Belloc would have been less pleased with Mr. Wells if the latter, instead of ignoring the Mass, had described it precisely as he conceived it.'

Two things this book does for the student of Monachism. It presents innumerable facts drawn from the most varied and, to most men, inaccessible sources; and it removes popular misconceptions. One of these is that the Middle Ages were wholly given over to credulity: in point of fact, however, we learn that there was not a little healthy scepticism. Many priests, *e.g.*, did not believe in Transubstantiation: that doctrine, though definitely consecrated by the scholastic theology of the twelfth century, was definitely combated as late as A.D. 1050. There were free-thinkers at the University of Paris who maintained that St. Augustine was no more inspired than Ovid.

Again, with regard to the Catholic knowledge of the Bible, Mr. Coulton has some interesting things to say in his chapter on St. Bernard. 'It was once a Protestant superstition that no Catholic ever knew his Bible well. . . . The rough truth may be put very simply; the best writers knew their Vulgate very well; a great many more knew parts of it well enough, especially those portions which happened to come in their service books. The average priest knew nothing outside those service books, and not even all that was inside; the lower priesthood . . . understood little or nothing even of their church offices. . . . But Bernard himself knew his Bible inside and out; Luther and Bunyan knew it no better.'

Another misconception he touches upon, this time in the sphere of Art. Much of what was noblest in architecture and painting was indebted for its ultimate inspiration to the teaching and preaching of men whose minds were puritanical to the point of severity. A great deal of nonsense, he reminds us, has been written about the inspiration and self-dedication of the average mediæval artist. St. Bernard's impulse must have inspired more than one creative hand and brain. In ancient and modern as well as in mediæval times, a healthy Puritanism has exercised a bracing influence even upon activities with which it may seem to have least sympathy.

In some very important respects, we are told, mediæval religion was far less narrow than modern Catholicism, whether Roman or Anglican; yet there is much in it which is not very creditable,

either in the intellectual or in the moral sphere. 'At the beginning of the eleventh century there was an epidemic of newly discovered relics, which brought considerable pecuniary profit.' The great pervasive weaknesses of mediæval Catholicism were its superstition and its intolerance. And the sum of the whole matter is, as Mr. Coulton says, near the beginning of his book, that 'much that is characteristic of monachism in general can hardly be found in the Christ of the Gospels'; or, as he puts it in his closing chapter, 'the true monk lived a noble life, but it was not really Christ's life.'

AUGUSTUS TO AUGUSTINE.

Dr. Ernest G. Sihler has been Professor of Latin at New York University for over thirty years, and is an experienced and sure-footed guide in the whole region of classical literature. But above everything else he is a passionate admirer of the Christian faith, is almost stunned by the glory of the difference its coming made, echoes with his whole being the saying of Paulsen that Christianity is not an evolution but the greatest revolution known to the records of men. All this he has put into his *From Augustus to Augustine*, Essays and Studies dealing with the contact and conflict of classic Paganism and Christianity (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net). Where the two run side by side it is not as big a book as Glover's *Conflict of Religions*, and at other places it is handicapped by the trying background in the reader's mind of the Decline and Fall. But it is a fine piece of first-hand scholarship, massive, learned, readable, with a happy knack of lighting on an apt phrase or illuminating parallel, as when we are told that in Lucian there is a strain that reminds one of Thackeray, cool and sane in face of excited eulogies, quietly bringing these exuberances and fervours to the test of the cold facts. But always there is first that enthusiasm for the Christian faith, its beauty, its gallantry, its amazing achievements. Indeed, so dazzled are Dr. Sihler's eyes by the splendour of Jesus Christ and His followers that the other stars gleam to him pale and wan. One feels that there is more to be said for the Stoics or the Neoplatonists and the like than he allows; that, careful though his studies of them are, he is not thinking with their minds or looking on life through their eyes, fails somewhat in the genius of sympathy. Yet things are usually so loaded the other

way by eager humanists that it is well to have this classical scholar with his blunt revelation that too much of the beauty of that world which still haunts men's minds was really an iridescence shimmering on the surface of much tragedy and ugliness; with his feeling that even in the best of the philosophers one misses the something one finds in the Testament (Plato, said Lactantius, dreamed of God, but he had not known Him; or, as Dr. Sihler puts it, compared to the single parable of the Prodigal Son, 'all the dithyrambic flights in Plato's myths are what to a famishing wanderer is some splendid baronial hall hung with arras, figures to look at, nothing more'); with his frank admiration for the faith, and his wonder at the mass and glory of its triumphs where the noblest of mankind had failed.

LETTERS OF PRINCIPAL LINDSAY.

In 1906, when Principal Lindsay was spending a holiday in Florence, he met Mrs. Ross at the house of a mutual friend. They found they had a great deal in common, and from then until the time of Principal Lindsay's death in the end of 1914, they kept up a constant correspondence. Mrs. Ross says she was attracted by the Principal's 'very blue eyes.' 'That was the beginning of a friendship which lasted until his death. Would that I had known him sooner!'

Mrs. Ross was an intimate friend of George Meredith. She had written several volumes of reminiscences, and when she first met Dr. Lindsay she was busy with a book on Pisa. Dr. Lindsay was Principal of the United Free Church College in Glasgow, and a great authority on Church history. In 1906 the first volume of his great work, 'A History of the Reformation,' had just come out. It was not to be wondered at, then, that Principal Lindsay and Mrs. Ross became fast friends.

And now Mrs. Ross has edited the letters which Principal Lindsay wrote to her, and they have been published by Messrs. Constable with the title *Letters of Principal T. M. Lindsay to Janet Ross* (18s. net).

The whole volume is made up of letters, for Mrs. Ross feels that they do not need an introduction. As she says, 'they tell their own story and depict the learned, witty, broad-minded, and kindly man far better than any words of mine could ever do.'

The letters make very good reading, though they

do not all contain such a spicy story as the one we quote. It is the first letter in the volume, and we give it in full:

' 37 WESTBOURNE GARDENS,
GLASGOW, 10th November 1906.

' DEAR MRS. ROSS,—Very many thanks for your delightful long letter. You need not fear to tire me with your Pisans.' I enjoy all your references to them. I do not know about Rutilius, but I have asked Susie, who is at present at Oxford with the Cairds, to enquire of some learned pundit there, and I have no doubt I shall be able to send you the information soon.

' I really ought to apologise for coming to you as a wolf in sheep's clothing; but I dislike uniform of all kinds and never wear clerical dress out of Scotland. They are quite a nuisance in travelling. A clerical garb is a sort of placard, "Enquire here for everything," especially to ladies, who demand strings, paper, ink and pens, the names of hotels, the proper tips to give, etc. etc. I remember once at Waterloo Station, when I was in uniform, a very ecclesiastical lady accosting me. "Are you a Churchman, Sir?" I naturally said, "Yes," forgetting for the moment that I was in a foreign land—then recollecting said: "I am a Presbyterian." The poor thing was quite dismayed at contact with a schismatic and gasped out—"Bu—Bu—But perhaps you can tell me the way to the underground railway?" Apostolic succession was not needed to give correct information on that point at least.

' As I must act up to profession I enclose a "tract," or what will do as well—some more jottings from the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*. I am sorry I gave you its name and set you hunting for it. It consists of eight huge folios, but contains after all but little information. The same things are repeated over and over again without variation. I think that with this last set of extracts I have taken out all that can be of any use. The *Resgesta*, on the other hand, is full of information; but I have sent you the cream of it. I hope to send one sheet more. I am not sure that I have translated all the words correctly. *Casale* I have always translated "site": but I suspect that it sometimes means "farm with buildings and serfs." Then *Curia* I once translated "space of ground without buildings"—that was, if I recollect rightly, the "Curia" at Babylon; but on reconsideration I believe that there, as in other

places, it means "law-court," and the privilege granted was that all disputes among the Pisans were to be settled in a law court of their own, and according to Pisan laws.

' I am glad you liked the address on Buchanan. It is to be published in a memorial volume, some time, I do not know when—and I must remember to send you a copy. One or two of the Essays will interest you, I am sure.

' Your description of your climate makes me envious. To-day we have frost and biting east wind. Yet I am remarkably well. The lazy holiday I had at Florence has done wonders for me.—Yours truly,

THOMAS M. LINDSAY.'

PALESTINE EXPLORATION.

Interest in the archæology of Palestine has been revived with the return of facilities for excavation. Tangible proof of the excellent work now being done is provided by *The Annual of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem*, vols. ii. and iii. for 1921–1922 (Yale University Press), which is conducted on lines similar to the Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement. A special feature of the 'Annual' consists in numerous photographic illustrations and plates (some coloured).

The first article, 'Contributions to the Historical Geography of Palestine,' by W. F. Albright, is of much importance, not for the number of sites identified, either with certainty or with a measure of probability, but because it is evident that this expert is working on right lines (following Macalister), with due appreciation of the value of the pottery index. He locates Ekron at Qatra instead of the usual 'Āqir, Gath at Tell el-Menšīyeh instead of Tell eš-Šāfi (8 miles distant), and Libnah on the usual site for Gath.

The second division of the article is concerned with 'Some Sites and Names in Western Galilee,' and, amid much that is tentative, the writer decides for Beth Anath = Be'neh, Beth Shemesh = Tell eš-Šemdīn, and Hannathon = el-Harbaj. He concludes: 'in the Plains of Esdraelon and Accho are vast treasure-houses of ancient remains, still to be tapped, for the most part. Some of the finest tells have not even been identified, as Tell Abū Šūseh.'

The concluding division deals with the complicated problem of the location of Tarichæ. The discussion is marked by sound and impressive argument throughout, with a decision in favour

of Magdala (Mejdel), *i.e.* the Magdala Šabbā'āyā in contrast to the Magdala Nūnāyā of the Talmud. In a note appended the writer allows that the conclusions reached are partly confirmed and partly require to be modified in the light of subsequent investigations by others.

The remaining articles can only be mentioned: 'Muslim Shrines in Palestine' and 'Epigraphic Gleanings,' by Chester C. McCown; 'Sepulchral Cup-Marks, Pools, and Conduits near Jerusalem,' by W. H. Worrell; 'A Painted Christian Tomb at Beit Jibrīn,' by Warren J. Moulton, the editor; 'A Few Ancient Seals' and 'The Scored Pebbles of Sidon,' by Charles C. Torrey; 'A Latin Inscription in the Lebanon' and 'A Catacomb Church on the Hill of Evil Counsel,' by James A. Montgomery.

MISS PANKHURST AS A PROPHET.

There are two remarkable features of the religious situation at present. One is the revival of an aggressive conservatism on critical questions. The other is an equally marked outburst of apocalyptic prophecy. The two features are closely related. They may, indeed, be parts of a single movement of thought, for the vivid expectation of a speedily impending advent of the Lord is based on a literalistic view of Scripture, and especially on a traditional interpretation of the prophetic literature.

The most notable of recent contributions to the Second Advent discussion is a book by Miss Christabel Pankhurst, LL.B., *The Lord Cometh: The World Crisis Explained* (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net). The significance of this book lies in the personality and history of its author. Miss Pankhurst was the protagonist in the women's suffrage movement. She believed that when women possessed a vote all would be well. But after the War she realized that this was an illusion, and, in view of post-war conditions, the future appeared to her dark and hopeless. Just then she chanced on some writings on Prophecy in a bookshop, and the discovery changed her whole outlook. Here was the clue to the maze. She found that God had foretold in the Bible the evils of this age and had clearly indicated the solution of them in the return of Jesus Christ. Her heart stirred to this, and her practical political eye saw in this Divine Programme the one solution of the international, social, political, and moral problems of our time.

This piece of autobiography is the prelude to a study of the predictions in detail. And, given her view-point, the exposition is convincing. It is a thankless task to discourage such ardent hopes, and it is all the more thankless because of the beautiful spirit of this book and its loyal devotion to Christ. These things will deeply move any reader. But it must be frankly said that the whole argument is based on a view of Scripture which is quite hopelessly antiquated. The writer puts the whole thing in a nutshell when she says: 'Biblical prophecy is simply future history.' With this in her mind the writer sees in the details of prophecy predictions of facts and events before our eyes to-day. But people with similar views have found the same fulfilments for hundreds of years. It is needless to argue the point. The real answer is the historic view of Scripture. But with the central contention of the writer all Christians will be in agreement. The one solution of present troubles is the presence and the power of Jesus Christ.

MALEBRANCHE.

In the histories of philosophy Malebranche has scarcely received justice. After two centuries a careful and scholarly collation of his numerous writings is still to seek. His most interesting philosophical work, *Entretiens sur la Métaphysique*, has only now been translated into English. Mr. Ginsburg has done his work as translator well. Malebranche rather contemned literary studies, but wrote, nevertheless, in admirable French. Mr. Ginsburg has, on the whole, turned it into admirable English. The dialogue is a form of literary composition which has its own pitfalls and difficulties. Plato stands unrivalled. Berkeley in *Alciphron* is charming. Malebranche comes behind him, but not very far. From the philosophic point of view, it is hard to understand the neglect of Malebranche. His position is very interesting. He does not occupy, as has been alleged, a half-way house between Descartes and Spinoza. He sees what Cartesianism has issued in with Spinoza, and his effort is to avoid that pantheistic terminus. We do not think that logically he succeeds, but in his attempt there is much that is suggestive and interesting. This book—*Dialogues on Metaphysics and on Religion*, by Nicolas Malebranche, translated by Morris Ginsburg, M.A. (16s. net)—is a valuable addition to Messrs. Allen & Unwin's 'Library of

Philosophy.' The introduction by the translator is masterly. The preface, by Professor G. Dawes Hicks, is one of the most excellent prefaces we have ever read.

BELIEF.

Among the most urgent tasks of the present day is an apologetic which will justify Christian faith and yet be loyal to the whole field of truth as that has been disclosed from other quarters. This is the task which the Rev. A. Boyd Scott, M.C., B.D., has set himself to accomplish in a book with the suggestive title: *Nevertheless We Believe: A Scottish Minister's Belief* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). Mr. Scott is minister of a church in Glasgow, and the substance of the book was delivered in the form of lectures from the pulpit on Sunday evenings. Such an origin is all in favour of a book of this kind, for its objective is just the kind of audience that would be attracted in a big city by such discussions. These discussions as they now appear have great merits. They reveal courage, originality, and a certain mental distinction. Perhaps the greatest merit of all is that their candour is likely to open a way for truth into minds that are not usually accessible to it.

Mr. Scott's aim is, in his own words, 'to exhibit, in the light of modern thought, the substance of the things commonly held among believers.' This purpose he has, on the whole, succeeded in fulfilling. He has been hampered in his course by taking the Apostles' Creed as the basis of his discussion. But this choice had at least the advantage of bringing him face to face with some of the gravest difficulties of the Christian position. His treatment of these will not be regarded by everybody as satisfactory. Many, even among those who are doubtful about the Virgin Birth, will feel that, when the case against it is so fully and ably stated, the case for it might also be put, in fairness to what may be called the catholic tradition. Another chapter that will not carry complete assent is that dealing with the post-Resurrection appearances of Christ. Mr. Scott agrees with Keim that these were not physical events but visions of Himself projected by the living Lord. The Ascension was simply a final demonstration of His reality in the same fashion.

These instances are not mentioned as representative of the book. The book is essentially sound on the main things. It is, above all, full of a deep reverence for Christ, and on the crucial question of

His eternal Sonship it takes the highest ground. A book so serious and so persuasive, will not fail to bring help and assurance to the minds for whom it was written.

The metaphysical treatment of the problems of existence is sufficiently rare to make any earnest and careful work of the kind welcome. *Our Infinite Life*, by Mr. William Kingsland (Allen & Unwin; 6s. 6d. net), is an essay of this kind, and is marked by strenuous and independent thinking. It is an idealistic interpretation of human life, but an idealism that has an open ear to science and makes use of the concepts not only of physical science but of the 'New Psychology' as well. It would be impossible to summarize the close-knit argument of the book in a brief notice, but it may be said that the main theme is the relation of the One Life, supreme and all-pervading, to the universe and to the individual life. The Cosmic Process, the development of individual selves within the all-inclusive Self, the nature of good and evil, the relation of cosmic mind to separate minds—all this and much more is expounded with remarkable ability and suggestiveness, and readers interested in these ultimate problems will find in the book before us a fresh and lucid treatment of them. The writer is, in the good sense, a rationalist, and it is refreshing, in days when unconscious instinct is regarded as the king of life, to find such a sound reliance on reason as pervades this argument.

In *From a Friar's Cell*, by Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P. (Blackwell; 6s. net), we have a series of essays on things theological and ecclesiastical which have an interest of their own as coming from the Roman Catholic standpoint and from the pen of one who combines real ability with a certain breadth of sympathy. The most significant chapters are those dealing, fairly and with a desire for real understanding, with the question of reunion. Perhaps the most interesting and revealing chapters are those which are purely theological or at least concerned with questions of criticism. Readers will know what to expect if we give the division of the first six chapters of St. John which occurs in an essay on 'The Doctrinal Witness of the Fourth Gospel': 'Chapter I. Holy Orders (calling of the Twelve), II. Matrimony (Marriage Feast at Cana), III. Baptism (Confirmation) (Dialogue

with Nicodemus), IV. (V.) Penance (Dialogue with the Samaritan Woman), VI. Holy Eucharist (Dialogue with Jews and Peter), (chap. XII. 1-8 extreme unction?).' The mark of interrogation is the author's! The book, however, is all over better than this. It is a gain to have the Roman point of view put so whole-heartedly and yet with such competence and humanity.

The hundred and third volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* has just been issued by Messrs. James Clarke (7s. 6d. net). The fare is as varied and as good as ever. As a sample of its quality we offer, in a slightly abridged form, a sermon by Mr. Spurr on 'The Centrality of Jesus Christ.' This will be found in 'The Christian Year.'

A popular introduction to the Third Gospel has been written by Rev. J. T. Pinfold, B.D., D.D., and published by the Epworth Press—*St. Luke and his Gospel: An Introduction* (3s. 6d. net). It is, on the whole, a good popular account of the main conclusions of criticism. The author is inclined to take his own fancies as ascertained facts. 'In Luke we discern the companion of Cleopas to whom was given the unspeakable privilege,' etc. Luke was converted by Paul's 'patience and faith' during an illness. 'St. Luke, as a physician, would be able from his professional standing to obtain information [about the Nativity] that would not readily be given to comparative strangers.' And, most surprising of all, 'if all the facts of their friendship were known, we should most likely find that the influence of St. Luke had been no small factor in the fashioning of St. Paul's theology'! It is fair to say that this kind of originality is only occasional. The writer reveals a good knowledge of the literature of his subject and a healthy scepticism of extreme views. He deals with all the relevant topics, such as the authorship, style, destination, and trustworthiness of the Gospel. The chapter on the sources is specially good. The teaching of the gospel is dealt with on broad lines, and the reader will at the end have quite a good knowledge of what has been said by sound criticism on these matters.

The Ethics of Gotama Buddha, by the Rev. C. H. S. Ward (Colombo: Frewin & Co.), is a pamphlet of some fifty-four pages, yet it is a real study, well worth reading. It is called an apprecia-

tion and a criticism, and it is both, dealing with central things and moving swiftly to the point. But on the whole the appreciation is a trifle niggardly and the criticism somewhat overstrained. No doubt it makes things easier to rule out consideration of Buddha's specific moral precepts on the ground that these 'are common to all teachers of morals in civilised communities'; and in that there is much truth. Yet the great moral teachers cannot be herded together in this promiscuous fashion; they display real originality in what they omit and where they lay the emphasis, and the order in which they arrange the virtues. And outside the Scriptures no one has shown more wisdom and discrimination in such things than Gotama. Aristotle's high-minded man is an unattractive creature compared with Buddha's ideal; and if the ethics of the Old Testament at its highest are exquisitely beautiful and tender, none the less the Buddhist canon is not marred by aspirations that the children of one's enemies be dashed against the stones. Such facts should be faced, and honour given where honour is due. Nor can one accept without many reservations Mr. Ward's central tenet 'that morality in Buddhism is pure egotism,' or feel anything but impatience with some of the arguments by which he seeks to buttress it. Indeed, his handling of the great scene where Buddha slowly makes up his mind to preach his gospel to the world, a scene which has awakened adoring gratitude in innumerable breasts, and inspired countless Buddhists to renounce their Nirvana to spend themselves for this needy earth, makes one wonder if Mr. Ward has come within sight of the real spirit of their faith. No doubt he is writing of the Singhalese Buddhists; but even so, if one is to found on logic, one must be logical all through. It is not easy to see the egotism of a faith which denies the existence of an ego, which makes one strive for righteousness not for one's own sake—there is no I—but for the sake of that other Being, as our minds would express it, who is the outcome of my karma. This is an interesting little book, but Buddha was much bigger than he is here represented. And Christ is so wonderful that no granting of their full due to the other masters can at all lessen Him, or hide the gap between Him and the nearest of them.

The most amazing thing about *Love's Most Excellent Way; or, Christian Courtship*, by Mr.

Andrew Borland, M.A. (Marshall Brothers ; 3s. 6d. net), is that it is written by 'a young man, unmarried.' The cynical would probably say it could only have been written by a bachelor ! The book is a complete guide to courtship and marriage. Nothing is overlooked. This, *e.g.*, is how you ought to write to your beloved—'Don't pass the bounds of actual reality . . . vary the address according to the conscious experience of the moment, but never give suggestion that love is not so ardent as before. . . . Write that which is good to edify . . . think a beautiful thought every day, and record each in the next letter. . . . Write nothing the publicity of which you would be afraid and ashamed of. . . . Study some famous letters as models.' There is a chapter on the proper way to dress when you are courting. The marriage ceremony is treated with becoming solemnity and thoroughness. The place especially is drastically discussed with sections on 'The Hotel Marriage,' 'The Neutral Hall Marriage,' 'The Home Marriage,' and 'The Church Marriage.' When it is mentioned that the Honeymoon has a chapter to itself it will be seen that the 'young man, unmarried' is not without courage. We commend his engaging wisdom to all who possess a sense of humour.

More than Conquerors is the title of a modest collection of discourses by the Rev. F. W. Ainley, M.A. (Marshall Brothers ; 2s. 6d. net). They are on familiar topics, and are soundly evangelical. There is nothing startlingly original in them, but they convey a sense of competence and experience, and they are such discourses as must have been very profitable to hear and still more profitable to apply.

The Hulsean Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge in 1921-1922 have just been published in a volume bearing the title *Erasmus the Reformer: A Study in Restatement*, by the Rev. Leonard Elliott Binns, B.D. (Methuen ; 5s. net). The motive of the writer may be put briefly. As the Renaissance of the fifteenth century was followed by the Reformation, it is certain the New Learning of the nineteenth century will have a similar fruit in the religious sphere. How are we to prepare for it, and in what spirit to face its tasks ? In that of the revolutionary, Luther, or that of the constitutional reformer, Erasmus ? The religious readjustment needed to-day is not so

much moral or ecclesiastical as intellectual, and in this sphere what we need is the spirit of wisdom and forbearance characteristic of Erasmus. The actual contents of the book can be indicated in a few words. The Times of Erasmus are first described ; then Luther's way of healing the hurt of the age is indicated ; next, the way of Erasmus, Reformation by Amendment ; and, finally, in 'The Lesson from Erasmus,' the bearing of these past events on the present needs is discussed. The great work the gentle reformer did was to help to build a bridge between the old world and the new which was coming to birth. And that is his significance for us. In each of three fields of life this readjustment is urgently needed—the scientific, the social, and the æsthetic. It is the spirit at least, if not the ideas, of Erasmus that should guide us in this task. Mr. Binns' graphic and suggestive lectures are not only a useful contribution to this necessary task of restatement ; they are an interesting and absorbing study of a great personality, setting him before us in all the fascination of his broad humanity.

A popular series of Bible Readings on the Epistle to the Hebrews has been issued by Messrs. Morgan & Scott. The writer is the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., and the title is *Let Us Go On: The Secret of Christian Progress in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (5s. net). The writer's standpoint is well known, and readers will know what to expect when it is said that the substance of the book was spoken at the Keswick Convention and Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, and subsequently appeared in the pages of *The Christian*. There are forty-one chapters, and each contains a devotional exposition of a section of the Epistle. The book is a good specimen of its kind and is sure to provide edification for readers such as those who originally heard the spoken word. The weakness of this particular school of exposition is that it is apt arbitrarily to select an idea and impose this as a keyword on a book of Scripture. The idea is not always the dominant one of the book, and in the present case it may be doubted whether the Epistle to the Hebrews has progress of any kind as its keynote. This, however, will not affect the practical value of the exposition, which has considerable merits.

Professor J. G. M'Kenzie, B.D., of the Paton Congregational College, Nottingham, has written

an excellent book for teachers with the title *Modern Psychology and the Achievement of Christian Personality* (National Sunday School Union; 2s. 6d. net). The book is a successful effort to state in a popular way the main conclusions of the 'New Psychology' and their application to religious education. The 'Achievement of Personality' is just the attainment of unity within the self, and Professor M'Kenzie describes in easy language the process by which this unity is attained. He first analyzes the basic elements of personality (Instincts, Conscience, Reason and Individuality); then describes the psychological processes by which these are unified into a personality (with an admirable chapter on the Will); and, finally, deals with factors in the making of personality (Heredity and Environment, Education, Conversion and 'Sanctification'). The treatment is thoroughly modern, but the writer nowhere surrenders his own independence, and at various points diverges from the current 'New Psychology.' The book is meant for teachers and is cordially commended to them, but it will be of great value to the ordinary reader who wishes to know what this 'New Psychology' is all about. In particular the writer is successful in reconciling the best elements in the new science with sound Christian teaching.

The Philosophy of Religious Experience, by Professor Eric S. Waterhouse, M.A., D.D. (Sharp; 6s. net), is a weighty book, the work of an able mind, and, although dealing with matters in themselves opaque, lucidly and readably written. What is religion? That ancient question, to which there has been a medley of answers, is the starting-point. Mr. Waterhouse defines it as the sense of a 'more-than-human order.' It is not inborn in man although of very ancient lineage, and has played so big a part in human life and development that no serious philosophy can overlook it. It is, indeed, so essential that once arrived it never really dies, but if it passes is only superseded by another type which fills the place never left vacant. Its origin is largely a feeling of awe and an instinct of self-preservation. Man finds himself 'planted in the midst of a huge workshop of moving machinery, surrounded by "live" cables, not knowing what he dare and dare not touch, seeing his comrades killed or injured as they moved to and fro. He was thus impelled on very practical grounds towards some attempt to safeguard himself. The

only method open to him was that of postulating and finding out whether his postulate worked.' His first idea was that he could control them, and hence magic; his second, that he could conciliate them; and out of this there grew religion, which has always had at the back of it the belief that these more-than-human powers are conciliable, and has slowly won its way to worthier conceptions of their character, to a belief that in reality there is 'a principle sympathetic to human good in its completest sense.' This postulate is verifiable; the proof is empirical, but no less real on that account. The book is divided into two sections, the former psychological, the latter philosophical. The whole is a serious contribution to an all-important subject.

This is the day of the biologist. He himself believes with assurance that he holds in his hand the key which will unlock the majority of the problems and some of the mysteries of life. And there are very many who agree with him. Among them is Mr. Henry Howard, who, in *The Church which is His Body* (Sharp; 6s. net), fastens on Paul's conception of the Church as a living organism with Christ as the Head, and, founding on the scientific statement of life's characteristics, applies these to the Church, with a wealth of biological illustration and analogy skilfully handled, in chapters on 'Organization,' 'Metabolism,' 'Development,' 'Differentiation of Function,' and 'Reproduction.' There are those who will hail the book as an obvious and complete success. Others may have a feeling that the metaphor is being rather overstrained. Readers should get the book and judge for themselves. It is interesting, touching in its course on a wide variety of topics, some of them rather unexpectedly shrewd and discerning, always readable and sometimes eloquent, the work of an earnest, thoughtful mind at home in spiritual things. One feature is the use made of etymology in pressing home religious truth. This is a fine Fernley Lecture which should stimulate many minds and illuminate and freshen many a sermon.

Cornaby of Hanyang, by Mr. Coulson Kernahan, with biographical chapters by Mrs. Cornaby (Sharp; 2s. 6d. net), is nearly a success. But there is something lacking. Either the materials were scanty, or else the best use has not been made of them. Certainly there is padding, as in a chapter headed 'Cornaby and R. L. Stevenson,' which merely

draws attention to some surface resemblances between the two. And yet, though the editor is at times a little trying, one catches from him something of his own glowing enthusiasm for the shy, sensitive man, reared in circumstances that sometimes recall Mark Rutherford—with his love of children, his skill in letter-writing, his open-heartedness to friends, his real learning, his notable distinction as a Chinese scholar, and, above all, his passion for God. Cornaby was a fine representative of Jesus Christ, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church has reason to be proud of him, a pride in which all sister Churches share.

The Week of Our Lord's Passion, by Mr. E. Theodore Carrier (Sharp; 2s. net), consists of six sermons, four of which, we are told, were taken down in shorthand by one or two who heard them. What has been admired by some may be admired by others. But most hearers would find these discourses colourless and superficial. When a preacher with such a text as our Lord's prediction of His Passion on the road to Jerusalem, remarks: 'Secondly, I want you to note the use which Jesus makes of that classic figure of speech which we call the Polysyndeton,' by which he merely means that, as the incident is reported, there are fifteen 'ands,' one's thoughts begin to wander, and one's irritation to grow hot.

A delightful series of devotional meditations is called *The Beauty of God*, by the Rev. F. Fielding-Ould, M.A. (Skeffington; 3s. 6d. net). The general subject is God's relation to man on its various sides, and there are chapters on 'The Presence of God,' 'The House of God,' 'The Fear of God,' 'The Service of God,' 'The Holiness of God,' and kindred themes. It is a beautiful little book, profoundly spiritual in its insight and outlook, but also full of real thinking that gives a solid background to the devotional element.

An admirable contribution to the history of Christianity is made by the book published by the S.P.C.K. entitled *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church*, vol. ii., A.D. 313-461. The editor is Rev. B. J. Kidd, D.D., and the price 6s. net. There are many famous passages included in the selection. We begin with Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, on 'The Persecution under Licinius,' and end with the Council of Orange on 'The

Catholic Doctrine of Grace.' Between these limits we have many notable names and the decrees of some of the decisive Councils. Arius is here, Cyril, Athanasius (13 extracts), Basil, Ulphilas, Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzus, Pelagius, Jerome (15 extracts), Augustine (33 extracts), and others. There are creeds and pastorals and liturgies, like the *Quicumque Vult*, the Nicene Creed, and the Liturgy of St. Mark. The source of each passage is indicated and an occasional sentence or two elucidates a point. The editor has exercised severe self-repression, but he has given us a piece of work of remarkable interest and value.

Professor E. D. Burton of Chicago has done the earnest student of the Gospels a signal service in his book just published—*A Source Book for the Study of the Teaching of Jesus in its Historical Relationships* (University of Chicago Press; \$2.00). Professor Burton has given his strength in his University lectures to the 'Teaching of Jesus,' and has constantly felt the need of a book which should present the material, both from the Gospels and from contemporary sources, in convenient form. He has therefore produced such a book himself. Its contents can be briefly indicated. There is an excellent introduction on the Sources (Gospels, Epistles, Acts, and extra-canonical books), the use of the Sources, a method of study, and finally some general hints to students. The main part of the book follows and contains the passages from each source, canonical and extra-canonical, relating to the various topics relevant in a study of the teaching of Jesus. These topics have been chosen with care and as a result of much experience in teaching. It will be seen that such a book, in which all that has been found in the literature of our Lord's age is set out before the eye and arranged under the proper headings, will be of immense use to students. It is admirably designed, and could have been produced only as the result of immense labour. It may be added that at the close of each section the modern works bearing on this particular subject are mentioned with a view to further reading. On p. 7, note, Professor Moffatt's name is spelt with one 't.'

A very able and thoroughgoing work on the life and teaching of Justin Martyr has been written by Mr. Erwin R. Goodenough, B.D., D.Phil.(Oxon.)—*The Theology of Justin Martyr*. Curiously enough,

it is published in Germany by the Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung (Walter Biedermann), Jena (Fr. 7.50). The printing and form are excellent, but the book bears evidence of its origin in numerous mistakes or misprints. There are errata of this kind on pages 11, 21, 36, 40, 44, 52, 76, and 101. These should be removed in a later issue, which the merits of the book are sure to demand.

The main interest of Justin, as the writer points out, is his transitional position. It is therefore important to know not only his influence on the growth of Christianity, but also the origin of conceptions in his writing which had a significance for the faith of the second century. The author consequently prefaces his study of Justin by two chapters on the character of the thinking which preceded and surrounded Justin in the Greek world. One is devoted to the development of Greek philosophic thought and deals with Anaxagoras, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, and the later Platonic school, and glances at the welter of crude superstitions and Eastern mysticism which filled the popular mind in Justin's age. The second gives a most interesting account of the nature and growth of Hellenistic Judaism from which Justin derived so much both in his thinking about God and in his interpretation of Scripture.

The essay which follows is a competent and able

survey of Justin's teaching. There are sections on his life and his writings; and in succession his apologetic, his theology proper, his doctrine of the Logos, his view of the world, matter, man and sin, of Christ and Redemption, and finally of eschatology, are dealt with exhaustively and with careful scholarship. Finally, there is a bibliography, occupying twenty-six pages and embracing nearly five hundred volumes. It will be seen that this latest contribution to patristic learning is the fruit of much labour. It is also written in a fresh and vigorous style, and will take its place as a reliable and comprehensive study of one of the most interesting of the ancient fathers.

The International Review of Missions (Oxford University Press) for July is a good number. Dr. Garfield continues his survey of the missionary significance of the last ten years, dealing in this number with India. There is a valuable contribution from Dr. Cheng on 'The Development of an Indigenous Church in China.' Other articles deal with Mission Work in Kenya, Polygamy in West Africa, and Missions and the Press (by Basil Mathews). The magazine maintains its reputation for a broad and enlightened view of the missionary task. It is well edited and always interesting as well as educative.

Ⓐ Reconciling Principle.

BY THE VERY REVEREND W. R. INGE, D.D., DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

'The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord.'—Pr 20²⁷.

THE numerous histories of the Church of England since the Reformation give us a picture of a sustained conflict between the Catholic and Protestant elements in a Church which, because it was national, had to be comprehensive and yet insular, embracing all except irreconcilables, but stiff against those who owned either a foreign allegiance or no allegiance at all. The whole history, when thus treated, is inextricably intertwined with secular politics, with the rising consciousness of nationality and stout independence under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth; the alliance with the monarchical principle under the Stuarts; the acceptance of the oligarchic régime while the ship floated on calm waters through

the eighteenth century; the response within the Church to the pietistic middle-class revolt which caused the Methodist secession; the revival of Laudian ecclesiasticism to meet the threatened Liberal attack upon the Church at the beginning of Queen Victoria's reign; and, lastly, the apparent rather than real *volte-face* of the epigoni of the new Laudians, who are bidding for the support of organized Labour. It is part of the ingrained politicism of English thought that Church history should be written in this way. The method and the centre of interest are much the same if, as in some Church histories, the relation of the Establishment to political and social movements is ignored, and the narrative deals with Church politics, with

the struggles of one faction after another to secure its position and gain predominance, with attempts to suppress 'enthusiasm' (as they said in the eighteenth century), or Liberalism, or Ritualism; with appointments to bishoprics and majorities in Convocation and Lambeth Conferences. These are the subjects which make Church history interesting to a nation which interprets all human life on the analogy, and often in the language, of a cricket-match or a prize-fight. The Englishman is, above all other races, a 'naturally political animal.'

But politics only touch the surface of Christianity. Even in the great Roman Church, which is the direct heir of the Cæsars, the one living survival of classical imperialism, there is an unbroken tradition, a true apostolical succession, of lives which are sheltered rather than directed by the imperial government, and which exhibit a recognizable type of character, the true life-blood of the institution. Without this tradition, no statesmanship could long maintain the political power of the Papacy. A Church can rely on brute force only when in close alliance with a secular government, and as a rule it is only an anti-popular government which cares to pay the price of such an alliance. Superstition is no doubt a powerful engine of theocracy; but it is weakened by every advance in knowledge and education, so that sacerdotalism can flourish only in backward peoples, who are in fact kept backward by the exigencies of hierarchical policy. The salt of Roman Catholicism is non-political. It is a distinctive type of piety, which is valued for its own sake, and which needs the shelter and expert guidance which the institution can provide.

That which is true of the Roman Church must also be true of the Anglican, if that form of Christianity is to continue as an important factor in the national life. There must be a type of character and a spiritual tradition which is fostered and sheltered by the institution. Or may there not be more than one? The English character is very complex. Besides the sturdy individualism, robust morality, and strong practicality which foreigners have noticed as our characteristics, there is a deep vein of sentiment, and a lofty idealism which has inspired some of the noblest poetry in the world. The English character rejects, on the whole, alien types—the fanatical racialism of the Jew; the Roman Catholic piety, which is at home only in the Latin nations; the hard and stern theology of Calvin; the emotionalism of the Lutherans;

though in our mixed population many examples of all these affinities may be found. The Church of England has a character of its own, which was developed when it was really the Church of the English people.

This is not said to encourage insularity, which is a weakness; still less to deny our enormous debt to those traditions which are common to all European civilization. My object is to remind you that besides the Catholic tradition, which has its source and centre in Rome, and the Reformation, which had its source in Germany, there is a third influence and tradition in Anglicanism, which has been far too much overlooked because it has been always non-political, a tradition and influence which have been always wholesome, always spiritual, and which awaken a response in the English character at its best—I shall call it the Renaissance tradition.

The Renaissance in England flowered very late, and characteristically produced masterpieces of literature rather than of art. The Shakespearean drama is, of course, its proudest achievement. But long before Shakespeare, even before the English Reformation, it appeared in England with More, Colet, and Erasmus, bringing a new devotion to the scholarly study of Holy Scripture and of Greek philosophy. By Greek philosophy I mean the unbroken chain of religious thought and speculation, from Plato to the Greek Fathers and the so-called Dionysius the Areopagite. We must not divide the names too sharply into Christian and non-Christian; for we are dealing with one of the main streams which came down from the old civilization to make up the river of Christianity, one of the integral and essential elements of the Catholic faith. Apart from this stream of influence, Christian dogma, the great work of the first four centuries, Christian philosophy as elaborated by the great Schoolmen, and modern Christian idealism, would have been impossible, and without knowledge of this stream of influence they are unintelligible. The Renaissance merely picked up threads which had been severed by the isolation of the West from the East during the Dark Ages. It gave back to the West not only the Greek writers, but the understanding of the Fourth Gospel and much of St. Paul. Erasmus, as is well known, had enthusiastic sympathizers in Dean Colet and Sir Thomas More, names always to be mentioned with the greatest respect. In these men and their friends we find a movement to simplify Christian doctrine; to inter-

pret the Bible by the canons of scholarship ; to harmonize Christianity with natural science ; to welcome free inquiry ; to exercise toleration. The Reformation diverted and partly submerged this movement ; and before long the struggle with the Counter-Reformation turned Protestantism into a religion of authority, and checked its further development. But Hooker belongs to the enlightened Renaissance school, and in the poetry of Spenser and Sir Philip Sidney Christianized Platonism is enshrined in words of immortal beauty. The seventeenth century was a critical time in the history of Anglicanism. Schemes of reunion were in the air, and were actively promoted by divines who represented the Renaissance tradition, such as Chillingworth, Hales of Eton, and Stillingfleet, with whom Jeremy Taylor may fairly be classed. These are among the greatest Churchmen of their time.

But more especially I wish to deal with that group of men who will always be among the greatest glories of our university. I mean Henry More, and his friends Whichcote, Provost of King's, Smith of Emmanuel, afterwards Fellow of Queens', Cudworth and Culverwel of Emmanuel, and Worthington, Master of Jesus. These men are generally known as the Cambridge Platonists, and in their lifetime were often referred to as Latitude Men, a nickname which referred not to the looseness of their dogmatic beliefs, but to their desire for reunion on a basis of comprehension. It is no fancy of mine to connect this movement with the English Renaissance. Henry More, as his biographer tells us, was brought up on Spenser's poetry, which his father used to read to him on winter evenings ; and it was the avowed object of the group to bring back the Church to 'her old loving nurse the Platonic philosophy.' As for their influence on the religion of their time, we may accept the unprejudiced evidence of Bishop Burnet. Speaking of the clergy of the Restoration, he says : 'They generally took more care of themselves than of the Church. . . . They left preaching and writing to others, while they gave themselves up to ease and sloth. In which sad representation some few exceptions are to be made, but so few, that if a new set of men had not appeared of another stamp, the Church had quite lost her esteem over the nation. Those were generally of Cambridge, formed under some divines, the chief of whom were Drs. Whichcote, Cudworth, Wilkins, More, and Worthington. Whichcote was a man of rare temper, very mild and obliging. He

had great credit with some that had been eminent in the late times, but made all the use he could of it to protect good men of all persuasions. He was much for liberty of conscience ; and being disgusted with the dry systematical way of those times, he studied to raise those who conversed with him to a nobler set of thoughts, and to consider religion as a seed of a deiform nature (to use one of his own phrases). In order to this, he set young students much on reading the ancient philosophers, chiefly Plato, Tully, and Plotin, and on considering the Christian religion as a doctrine sent from God both to elevate and sweeten human nature, in which he was a great example as well as a wise and kind instructor. Cudworth carried this on with a great strength of genius and a vast compass of learning. More was an open-hearted and sincere Christian philosopher.'

Although Cudworth's book has taken the higher rank in the history of English philosophy, the two members of the group whose writings are most attractive to modern readers are Whichcote and John Smith. The latter is not named by Bishop Burnet, because he died very young ; but he left behind him a fragrant memory and a small collection of sermons which are perhaps the finest academical sermons ever preached. Whichcote's sermons are to be found in many eighteenth-century libraries ; but still more popular was a book of aphorisms collected from them. His epigrammatic style made it easy to cull gems from his writings, which display considerable wit and wisdom.

He insists that the reason, man's highest endowment, must have its place in religion. 'Sir, I oppose not rational to spiritual, for spiritual is most rational.' 'The mind of a good man is the best part of him, and the mind of a bad man is the worst part of him.' The essentials of religion, however, are simple. 'There is nothing in religion necessary, which is uncertain.' And he lays special stress on the good that we may win by friendship with the good. 'I give much,' he says in a letter, 'to the Spirit of God breathing in good men, with whom I converse in the present world, in the University and elsewhere ; and think that if I may learn much by the writings of good men in former ages, which you advise me to, and I hope I do not neglect, that by the actings of the Divine Spirit in the minds of good men now alive I may learn more ; and I must not shut my eyes against any manifestations of God in the times in which I live. The times in which I live are more to me

than any else. The works of God in them which I am to discern direct in me both principle, affection, and action. And I dare not blaspheme free and noble spirits in religion who search after truth with indifference (=impartiality) and ingenuity, lest in so doing I should degenerate into a spirit of persecution.'

The following miscellaneous sayings from the sermons need no introduction or explanation :

'Heaven is first a temper and then a place.'

'He that never changed any of his opinions never corrected any of his mistakes, and he who never was wise enough to find out any mistake in himself, will not be charitable enough to excuse what he reckons mistakes in others.'

'The longest sword, the strongest lungs, the most voices are false measures of truth.'

'I will not make a religion for God, nor suffer any to make a religion for me.'

'It is a very great evil to make God a means and the world an end.'

'The spirit of religion is a reconciling spirit.'

'If I have not a friend, God send me an enemy.'

'A proud man hath no God; an unpeaceable man hath no neighbours; a distrustful man hath no friend; a discontented man hath not himself.'

'Every man taken at his best will be found good for something.'

'He that repents is angry with himself; I need not be angry with him.'

'In worldly and material things, what is used is spent; in intellectual and spiritual things what is not used is not had.'

'Sin is an attempt to control the immutable laws of everlasting righteousness, goodness, and truth, upon which the universe depends.'

'Reverence God in thyself; for God is more in the mind of man than in any part of the world besides.'

'Take away the self-conceited and there will be elbow-room in the world.'

'None are so empty as those who are full of themselves.'

The merits of John Smith are of a different kind, since he was a learned Platonist, and fond, too fond, of quotation. But there is the same vein of satire mixed with his exhortation. Here are a few sentences from one of his Discourses, on 'The Way of attaining to Divine Knowledge.'

'Were I asked to define divinity, I should rather call it a Divine life than a Divine science.' 'He that is most practical in Divine things hath the

purest and sincerest knowledge of them, and not he that is most dogmatical. Divinity is a true efflux from the eternal light, which, like the sunbeams, does not only enlighten but heat and enliven; and therefore our Saviour hath in His beatitudes connext purity of heart with the beatifical vision. The knowledge of Divinity that appears in systems and models is but a poor wan light, but the powerful energy of Divine knowledge displays itself in purified souls.' 'While we lodge any filthy vice in us, this will be perpetually twisting up itself into the thread of our finest-spun speculations; it will be continually climbing into the bed of reason, to defile it; like the wanton ivy twisting itself about the oak, it will twine about our judgments and understandings, till it hath sucked out the life and spirit of them.' 'Such as men themselves are, such will God Himself seem to be. That the Deity is in some way or other like themselves, their souls do more than whisper it, though their lips speak it not; and though their tongues be silent yet their lives cry it upon the housetops. There is a double head, as well as a double heart.' 'We have many grave and reverend idolaters that worship truth only in the image of their own wits; that could never adore it so much as they seem to do, were it not that they find their own image and superscription upon it. There is a knowing of the truth as it is in Jesus, as it is in a Christlike nature, as it is in that sweet, mild, humble, and loving spirit of Jesus, which spreads itself like a morning sun upon the souls of good men, full of light and life. There is an inward beauty, life, and loveliness in Divine truth, which cannot be known but only when it is digested into life and practice.' 'He that will find truth, must seek it with a free judgment and a sanctified mind; he that thus seeks shall find; he shall live in truth, and that shall live in him; it shall be like a stream of living waters issuing out of his own soul; he shall drink of the waters of his own cistern and shall be satisfied; he shall every morning find the heavenly manna lying on the top of his own soul, and be fed with it to eternal life.' 'This life is nothing else but God's own breath within him, and an Infant Christ (if I may use the expression) formed in his soul. This knowledge is here but in its infancy; there is a higher knowledge, or a higher degree of this knowledge that doth not, that cannot, descend upon us in these earthly habitations. Yet is it a true heavenly fire kindled from God's own altar.'

You will judge whether these writers deserve the neglect with which their own University, together with the rest of England, treats them. It is not the interest of either party in the Church to push them forward; publishers are afraid that a new edition of them would not sell. But they represent, as I have said, a vital and genuine tradition in English theology, and it may be that they can give us just that for want of which the Church is now, in Bishop Burnet's words, losing its esteem with the nation.

It must not, however, be supposed that the influence of the Cambridge school died with them. The eighteenth century was very unfavourable to their type of religion; but in William Law, the most virile intellect and character in the English Church during that century, we have undoubtedly a kindred spirit. It is true that he does not admit any debt to the school of Plato, and speaks with disrespect of Henry More; but this seems to have been prejudice, based on the connexion of the Cambridge men with the Puritan College, Emmanuel (his own College, by the way); for Law was a High Churchman and Non-juror; and on their trust in human reason, which he did not distinguish from the dry rationalism of his own time. In all essentials, his teaching is that of Smith and Whichcote. A little later, no one can doubt that Wordsworth and Coleridge were in the direct line of succession from the Platonizing poets of the Renaissance; or that Frederick Denison Maurice and his friends belong to the school of Colet and More. Bishop Westcott, on one side, may be claimed as one of the same brotherhood, and numerous Christian philosophers down to our own day.

I repeat, then, that besides the contributions of the Latin West and of the German Reformers, we must admit that the Anglican Church has received a third affluent, not less important than the other two, which comes ultimately from Greece; which, after flowing underground and obscure during the Dark Ages, came again to the surface at the Renaissance, and has ever since been one of the constituent elements of our religious life. And I wish in conclusion to give my reasons for thinking that in this type of religion we may find a reconciling principle which may enlist the sympathies of the most thoughtful members of the Catholic and Evangelical parties in the Church; a vitalizing principle which may recall us all to the contemplation of those spiritual realities which the popular

secularized Christianity of our day has so grievously obscured; and a principle of unity which may bring together those like-minded servants of Jesus Christ who are at present separated from each other by denominational barriers which are becoming more unreal and meaningless in each generation.

It is a reconciling principle; for while the Cambridge group were, as I have said, attached to a Puritan College, and were strongly anti-Roman, we find High Churchmen like Aubrey Moore congratulating themselves that theology is becoming 'more Greek'; and as we have said, its roots were planted in England before the Reformation, though not before Reform. It points us back to the Greek Fathers, who are far more congenial to most of us than the Latins, and past them to St. Paul and St. John, and to the unbroken eight centuries of earnest thought between Plato and the closing of the Athenian Schools by Justinian.

It is a vitalizing principle; for it is a spiritual, an idealistic, revival that we want. 'We look not to the things that are seen, but to the things that are not seen; for the things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are not seen are eternal.' This, and not political agitation, is the Church's message.

It holds out a hand to the advocates of reunion, not only because this school has consistently advocated a comprehensive Church, but because it draws its breath in a region where Christendom is not and never has been divided, in the region where men are near to each other because they are near to God.

Lastly, it counts nothing human alien to itself, and least of all the great achievements of human science. It is built, not on historical evidence, which many think too doubtful to build much upon it, but on the nature of the human mind itself. As Whichcote was fond of quoting, 'The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord, lighted by God and lighting us to God,' words which remind us of the fine saying of Macarius, 'the throne of the Godhead is the mind of man.'

'I oppose not natural to spiritual; for spiritual is most natural.' So we get rid of the dualism, most untruly ascribed to Plato, which has been the source of many errors in the Church. The world is one, a stairway leading from the inorganic to the pure life of spirit in its own sphere. This is the Logos doctrine for our time. It is the doctrine of Origen, and of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel.

Biblical Scholarship in the Indian Church.¹

BY PROFESSOR JOHN E. MCFADYEN, D.D., GLASGOW.

THE appearance of the four under-noted volumes is of more than usual interest. It is of the utmost importance that the best home scholarship be adequately represented in the foreign field. This is not easy. Difficult as it is for the active ministry at home to keep abreast of the work of Biblical scholars, it is doubly difficult on the mission field, where innumerable other problems of the most perplexing and intricate kind are continually pressing upon the hard-worked missionaries. There is also the risk of obscurantism. When we remember how completely this spirit dominates, not indeed the ministry, but large sections of the membership of the home Church, and how many devoted men, in certain areas of the mission field, cling tenaciously to obsolete or obsolescent views of Scripture, and how easily this spirit is encouraged amid a pressure of duties that leave little time for study, we cannot but rejoice over every evidence from missionary lands of genuine interest in modern Biblical scholarship, and more especially where that desire is accompanied by the propaganda spirit, which seeks to spread among others the enrichment and enlightenment by which it has itself been blessed. That is why we extend so cordial a welcome to these books of Canon Sell. The Canon, who is an authority on Muhammadan history and religion, has already won an enviable reputation as an Arabic and Persian scholar, and it is fortunate for the Indian Church that he is now directing his scholarship upon the practical interpretation of the Old Testament. The first volume comes commended to us by the Bishop of Tinnevely, the second by the Bishop of Madras, and the fourth by the Bishop of Travancore.

Teachers of the Bible and of theology at home have frequently the experience of being consulted by missionaries as to the best means of presenting what is now most surely believed among us, and of being urged to make some contribution that would prove useful in the lands across the sea; but the

sanest of these teachers recognize that this work can be best done by the more scholarly missionaries themselves, who have a first-hand knowledge of the native religions and peoples, and that it will probably be done some day even better still by native converts, when they have assimilated the scholarship of the West. While there is practically nothing in the books under review which could not have been written in England, it is all to the good that they were written upon Indian soil and with India constantly in view. They are written, as the Prefaces inform us, 'primarily for the Indian clergy'; and the Bishop of Madras, in commending the volume on *The Minor Prophets*, reminds us that 'there is a close correspondence in many respects between the social conditions of Judah and Israel in the days of the prophets and those of India at the present time, and the words spoken in those days under the inspiration of the Spirit of God are equally needed in India to-day.'

It is of good omen, too, that these volumes deal with the Old Testament. That the chief business of a Christian missionary is to present distinctively Christian truth, and that the New Testament will therefore be his principal manual of instruction, goes without saying. But it will be an evil day for the Christian Church, whether at home or abroad, when the Old Testament is neglected. And it is more than pleasant to find the prophets coming to their own again in the continent on which their voices first were heard.

The Songs of the Outlaw, and Other Songs, embody, within the compass of 134 pages, a study of forty-eight psalms, six being 'Songs of the Outlaw' (Pss 52. 56* 34. 7. 54. 31), ten 'Songs of the King' (18. 24. 20. 21. 51. 55. 53. 3. 4. 28. 23), 'Song of Asaph' (80), eight 'Royal Songs' (93-100), the fifteen 'Songs of Degrees' (120-134), the 'Song of an Exile' (137), five 'Songs of Praise' (146-150), and two 'Songs of the Persecuted' (74. 79).

In each case the writer's aim is to view each psalm in the light of the historical events connected with it, and to apply its truth to the circumstances of our own lives. There is no attempt at detailed or exhaustive comment. Indeed, the old type of Commentary seems to be passing. Even in Commen-

¹ (i) *The Songs of the Outlaw, and Other Songs*; (ii) *The Minor Prophets*; (iii) *The Life and Times of Jeremiah*; (iv) *After Malachi*. All four volumes are by the Rev. Canon Sell, D.D. (Madras S.P.C.K. Depository, Vepery; R.1 each.)

taries written by professional scholars it is more and more coming to be recognized that much more is needed than the mere accumulation of relevant and irrelevant information, and that unless some sort of justice is done to the religious spirit of the book commented upon, the labourer labours in vain. Kittel's great Commentary on The Psalms in the 'Kommentar zum Alten Testament' series edited by Sellin, could be read throughout for 'edification,' in the narrower as well as in the wider sense of that word. So Canon Sell does not linger over trifles.

But while he is thoroughly alive to the modern criticism of the Psalter, his own instincts, as the title of this book suggests, are conservative. He prefers, indeed, the Maccabean date for Pss 74 and 79; he believes Pss 93-99 to be early post-exilic, incidentally admitting the difficulty of finding any definite date for Ps 94 at all; he regards the Pilgrim Psalms (120-134) as 'most appropriate to the anxious conditions of the community after the Restoration.' But, partly because he lays more stress on the superscriptions than modern scholars allow to be defensible, he clings to the Davidic authorship of not a few psalms. David is the outlaw who sings the songs discussed in the first section of his book. Indeed, he opens the discussion, in commenting on Ps 52, with the words, 'This is the first of a number of psalms connected with David's flight from Saul.' One who has been for years accustomed to the drastic relegation of almost the entire Psalter to the post-exilic period, might be inclined to take umbrage at so dogmatic a statement, and to regard it as boding ill for the value of the book. But this would not be altogether fair. For its value does not lie in its criticism, but (i) in its appropriation of the Psalter's spiritual values, and (ii) in its conviction, which most scholars share, that behind each psalm lies some historical, as obviously some inner and personal, experience, and that, if we could only recover it, the psalm would gain in vividness and power. If in the attempt to recover it, Canon Sell has gone the way of Delitzsch and Dr. MacLaren, at least we cannot deny that the attempt has been dictated by a sound instinct and not in the spirit of obscurantism. If for him the only question affecting Ps 23 is whether the psalm was composed in the earlier or later part of David's career, and if he still claims Ps 51 as the song of David's penitence, it is not because he does not know that 'others look upon the psalm as expressing the sin of the nation, praying for forgiveness and

restoration from exile.' In dealing with the sub-Christian temper of Ps 137⁷⁻⁹, which, of course, he makes no attempt to extenuate, he suggestively adds: 'When we remember all that Israel had suffered, we shall not wonder that in the history of a warlike nation such utterances occur. *The real wonder is that they are so few.*'

The volume on *The Minor Prophets* shows that Canon Sell has read Professor Robertson Smith and Sir George Adam Smith to good purpose. Here again, however, there is to be detected the same conservative strain as we noted in his treatment of the Psalms. He remarks, e.g., that 'the Levites explained the law; the prophets enforced it.' If 'the law' is here taken in the sense which it usually carries in the minds of those who draw such contrasts, few scholars would endorse the statement. Again, Canon Sell accepts the earlier date for Joel, whom he regards as a predecessor of Amos; the Book of Micah he treats as a literary unit; and the great ode in Hab 3 is viewed as integral to the book, and Habakkuk's own. But on these questions every man who examines the evidence on both sides, as the Canon has done, is entitled to his own opinion; and in any case the religious quality and homiletic suggestiveness of the exposition are in no way affected by such decisions.

The summaries of the contents of each prophetic book are well done, even when, as in the case of so perplexing and confusing a book as Hosea, they are difficult to do; and the permanent value of even the least of them is happily indicated. Of Haggai he says that 'he speaks to the point, deals with the circumstances of his day, and succeeds in getting men to do their duty'—three by no means despicable qualities. His view of Jonah is sound. That book is 'a great missionary plea,' written after the return from exile, and our Lord's use of it is regarded as not binding us to a belief in its entire historicity. 'We use traditions of the past, poetic creations and the like to enforce our teaching. Shall we deny to our Lord that which we do ourselves?' The unworthy tone of Mal 4³ is perhaps not sufficiently emphasized.

In his discussion of Nahum, Canon Sell takes occasion to illustrate the appositeness of the prophetic message to the circumstances of our own time; it may turn out indeed to be more apposite than the Canon's words allow for. The lesson of the book, he tells us, is that 'a righteous Lord ruleth over all; a lesson we see in force in our

own day, when a mighty empire—proud, selfish, and brutal—has fallen at last to the ground. Our song of triumph may be in softer tones than that of Nahum; but we with him can rejoice that the yoke of the oppressor has been broken, and that by the grace of God right has prevailed over might.' But the world has little to gain by the substitution of one tyranny for another. Right is still being imperilled and defeated by might, and the moral order may yet have to be vindicated by the collapse of other tyrannies than Germany's.

In one point Canon Sell is too tender to Nahum. He passes too lightly over his 'nationalism' in the words, 'Judah is idealized, for no mention is made of her sin or her need of repentance and reform.' The great prophets were never guilty of an omission like that. It is not an adequate explanation to say that 'the prophet lived far away.' The plain truth is, as Professor T. H. Robinson has recently said (*Prophecy*, p. 114), that Nahum is the representative of a purely patriotic type of prophecy, which the true prophets would have denounced as false prophecy. 'What Jeremiah would have said about Nahum is beyond dispute; he was almost certainly amongst those prophets whom the latter denounced.'

Taken as a whole, these studies on *The Minor Prophets* would form an admirable guide to teachers or preachers who were preparing to conduct a class or a congregation over that too little known territory.

A specimen of somewhat more detailed study is offered by Canon Sell in *The Life and Times of Jeremiah*—one of many evidences that that great prophet is at length coming to his own. Here, as in the other volumes, the Indian Church is in view. 'Surely the prophet's view of the nations should be an inspiration and encouragement to the Indian Church and an earnest call for faithfulness on its part.' This prophetic book is a revelation of an uncommonly great and sensitive spirit, besides being the record of a singularly important historical period, for many details of which indeed it is our only authority. In the course of a running exposition, Canon Sell deals successfully with both these aspects of it. There is space to call attention to two points only. (i) He says, in speaking of the prophet's imprecatory prayers, that, 'if we see any slight traces of personal vindictive-

ness, we must remember that he is not to be judged by the standard of the Gospel age, but by that of his own.' This is true, but this consideration might be fruitfully supplemented by the truth at which Canon Sell hints, but which is presented more explicitly by Sir George Adam Smith in his 'Teaching of the Old Testament in Schools', where he explains Jeremiah's delirious words as due, in part, to the absence of a faith in the life to come. (ii) Again, on the difficult question of Jeremiah's counsel to his countrymen to surrender to the Chaldeans, he simply says, 'Jeremiah came to the sad and bitter conclusion that safety lay only in non-resistance.' This passive and seemingly unpatriotic attitude of the prophet merits further discussion, and receives it in a striking article, also by Sir George Adam Smith, in the *Expositor* for July, where he argues that Jeremiah was really justified in his pacifist counsel by the fact that for him 'the divine right lay with Nebuchadnezzar,' as Zedekiah, by his revolt, had broken the solemn oath which he had made to the Babylonian monarch, swearing by the name of the national God, whose name he bore. Zedekiah 'had broken a covenant not only human but divine.'

The volume *After Malachi* deals with the Apocrypha and the Apocalyptic books, sketching their historical background and giving a brief résumé of the more important of them. This short discussion of the inter-Testamental period would be helpful to others as well as Indians; but the writer has the Indian Church mainly in view. He hopes that 'the constancy and heroic struggle of the Maccabees to gain their religious liberty, their patience under trial, and their absolute belief in the power, wisdom, and love of God may be a support and inspiration to the whole Indian Christian community.' When we find the Bishop of Travancore, in a similar strain, writing, 'In the days to come we know not what tribulation the Indian Church may be called upon to endure in the advanced stages of its conflict under the banner of the Cross,' we wonder whether grave events are anticipated or impending. Whatever comes, books like these will enable their readers to meet it in the spirit and faith of those ancient Hebrew men who overcame; and it is much to be hoped that Canon Sell will continue this good work of popular exposition, for which he is so eminently fitted.

The Seventeenth Chapter of Genesis.

By ÉDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D., HON. PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA.

IN the EXPOSITORY TIMES of December 1921 (p. 127) the present writer showed that the LXX translated *El-Shaddai* quite differently from the real meaning of the Hebrew word. In the seven examples of this compound name of God which occur, *Shaddai* is not rendered by a Greek term—‘*the Almighty*,’ but by a possessive pronoun—‘*the God of me*’ (‘of thee,’ ‘of them’), showing that the LXX used a version which I believe to have been Aramaic, but which in this case had preserved the reading of an older text.

In the 17th chapter of Genesis there is another word translated, namely *Yahveh* (יהוה), or in its original form יהו, which is rendered by *Yahu*, κύριος. If at the end of the first verse we have *El-Shaddai* translated by ὁ θεός σου, we have every reason to conclude that at the beginning κύριος is a translation of יהוה.

It has been said repeatedly that, the name JHVH never being pronounced, the four letters had received the vowels of *Adonai*, אֲדֹנָי, κύριος, so that this word was always to be substituted for JHVH. But this substitution is certainly of later date than the LXX translation; here they gave the sense of the word, as for *El-Shaddai*, so that afterwards, when the Jews read *Adonai* instead of *Yahveh* or *Yahu*, they read the translation of the word; they did not substitute one word for another.

Yahveh said unto *Abram* at *Haran*: ‘Get thee out of thy country,’ which means in modern language that *Abram* left *Haran* for a religious reason, because he was a worshipper of *Yahveh*. Probably there was great hostility against him, and he left *Haran* in order to be quite free and unmolested in his worship. *Yahveh* or *Yahu* was the name of his God, of his *Elohim* at *Haran*. *Elohim* has the general sense of ‘God,’ but it means also a god, a divinity. In antiquity, as now with non-Christian nations, the *Elohim* of each people had a name. The *Elohim* of the Philistines was *Dagon*, and they speak of him as their *Elohim* (Jg 16²³). In the scene on Mount Carmel (1 K 18²⁷) *Elijah* mocks the priests of *Baal* and says to them, ‘Cry aloud, for he is an *Elohim*.’ What marks the difference between the *Elohim* of *Elijah* and the

Elohim of the priests is the name. *Yahveh* or *Yahu* was the name of the *Elohim* of *Abram* at *Haran*; *Abram* took the name with him to *Canaan*, and there *Yahveh* told him that He would be his God and the God of his posterity.

Reverting now to the LXX, if κύριος is a translation, do we find in the language which *Abram* spoke a word sounding like יהו of the Aramaic papyri, יאוו, יאוו of the Greeks, and meaning κύριος? The question here arises, What was the language of *Abram*? If it was Semitic, which seems most probable, which was it of the dialects spoken in Mesopotamia? Was it Akkadian or Amorite; or could it be the non-Semitic Sumerian of Ur?

On the word *Yahu*, one of the leading French Assyriologists, P. Scheil, kindly gave me the following information:

For *Yau* we find in Sumerian *i, ia*, which means ‘height,’ ‘glory,’ ‘to be high or lofty.’ This is not κύριος. At the time of *Hammurabi* are found the following proper names:

Yau-um-ilu, *Yawi-ilu*, ‘*Yau* is god.’ In this case it is generally thought that *Yau* is a West-Semitic god.

This does not give us the sense of the name *Yau*, but it agrees remarkably well with Professor Clay’s views. *Abram* is an *Amurru*, a West-Semite, and it is natural that his god should be West-Semitic. When he leaves *Haran*, he goes West towards the country from which the West-Semites originated, and this land is given to his posterity for an heritage.

The life of *Abraham*, as it is described in Genesis, is nothing but the narrative of the election of *Abram* and his posterity by *Yahveh*, who will be their God; they are chosen to be the worshippers of *Yahveh*, who will say: ‘I am the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*.’

The god of a nation or a city has always a name. The Egyptians, for instance, have a word, *nouti*, which corresponds exactly with *Elohim*; it conveys the idea of ‘Godhead’ in general; but it may also designate the god attached to a locality or to a city, where he has always a name. The temples are not dedicated to nameless gods; they are built at Thebes for *Amon*, at Denderah for *Hathor*, at

Memphis for Phtah. Amon or Phtah are *nouti*, 'gods,' but *nouti* is not only Amon, it may stand for many other gods. It is the same with *Elohim* and *Yahveh*. The two words are not synonymous. *Yahveh* may be called *Elohim*, but *Elohim* is not necessarily *Yahveh*. It may stand for Baal, or Moloch, or the gods of the Egyptians or the Syrians, or others. Therefore one cannot always use the two names *ad libitum*. There are cases in which one or the other is necessary, or both have to be used together.

This is the case in the chapter we are studying. Abram knows *Yahveh*, since he has already heard these words: 'I am *Yahveh* that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees.' To which Abram has answered, 'O *Yahveh Elohim*, whereby shall I know.' . . . Now *Yahveh* is going to make a covenant 'to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.' Here it is obvious that the two names *Yahveh* and *Elohim* must be used. It is an alliance between *Yahveh* and Abram, in which *Yahveh* settles that He will be Abram's *Elohim*. It is clear that in the description of a contract, both contracting parties must be named. The writer of the chapter could not do otherwise.

Nevertheless we are told that we have to bow before the critical theory which has a ruling voice. There are an *Elohist* and a *Yahvist* writer; and, since the name *Elohim* is predominant, the chapter must be by the chief *Elohist* writer, the Priestly Code, a post-exilic document which never uses the name *Yahveh* before the Exodus. Therefore the name *Yahveh* cannot be admitted in this chapter, it must be an interpolation due to a late redactor, and instead of *Yahveh* we must read *Elohim*.

An *Elohim* says to Abram, 'I am thy *Elohim*; I

make an everlasting covenant to be an *Elohim* unto thee and unto thy seed after thee.' This *Elohim* who will be Abram's god, who is he? Is he Dagon, Moloch, or a god Abram brought from Egypt? Every man has an *Elohim*, and this covenant might have been made in the same terms with Abimelech or any one of Abram's neighbours. A god says to Abram, 'I am thy God'; that is a formula which may be applied to any one. It is evident that here there must be a name. The critical theory makes of this sentence and of the whole chapter a composition which has no sense. This chapter is certainly the most positive condemnation of the theory of the *Elohist* and *Yahvist*, and also of Kuenen's idea, which has been adopted by many critics, that the name *Yahveh* was not known to the Hebrews before the Exodus.

I shall not dwell on what I said in my former article. Expunge *Yahveh*'s name from Abraham's life, and you destroy entirely the history of this patriarch, which unfolds itself in the most simple and logical way. He leaves Haran to be faithful to *Yahveh*, who promises to him that his posterity will be a great nation in the land where he is going to settle. This promise is confirmed by an alliance. A more solemn covenant is that in which *Yahveh* declared to Abram that he will be his God and the God of his seed after him; and the guarantee of that covenant is circumcision, which, being practised through all generations, will remind them of it. The whole biography of Abraham is the narrative of the dealings of *Yahveh* with the patriarch, the man elected to be the father of a nation worshipping *Yahveh*. Strike out the name *Yahveh*, and what remains of Abraham's life?

In the Study.

Virginitibus Puerisque.

Keep Step.¹

'All these heart of war, that could keep rank, came with a perfect hennet to Hebron, to make David king over all Israel.'—I Ch 12³⁸.

WHAT an impressive thing it is to see a great body of men in ordered ranks, marching along with perfect

¹ By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

step. Their mighty tramp thrills you. You march with them, and if you are tired you feel less tired, you catch some of their strength. It's easier to march in a great company than to walk alone; and it is easier to march in rank and in step than when every one takes his own pace. Then the step goes and the ranks sag, tiredness soon shows itself; but a drum tap or a voice to give the time pulls every one together. With the rhythm of the one

step and the contact of ranks, strength is shared and increased. It is so purposelike, so strong, when men 'keep rank with a perfect heart.'

Most of life is just learning to do this. At school, in the arithmetic class you are learning to keep step with the law of figures. You simply must do it. In the singing class you are learning to keep step with the law of music. The choir has to practise keeping rank, or it isn't a choir. It is not a lot of people all singing solos on their own. It is only a choir when each takes his part in a common effort. You can't take your own time. Each must take the time of all, sing with the conductor's beat, keep rank with the music.

To be healthy we must keep step with the law of nature. We can't go as we please. We are not allowed to. Health is everybody's business, and if we get fever we have to fall out and get away by ourselves and not come back till we are in step and rank with the law of health. Conduct is keeping step with the law of God. We must walk in His statutes, keep in line with His commandments.

Some people think they need not. They go their own way, choose their own step. They are full of their own conceit and as pleased with themselves as the fond mother who came home from the review and said proudly, 'A' the troops were out o' step but my Jock!' They call goodness 'slow.' God's pace is not quick enough for them. They like to be called 'fast' and 'advanced.' They think all the world is out of step with them. They make a sad mess of it, and are worn out and tired and disappointed long before the long day's march is done.

It is wise to keep rank with those who march with God, who dress 'by the right'; and wise to remember that there is One who leads our march and sets our pace and step, Jesus Christ. He will not set a step that is too long for little children. Sometimes one sees a father taking a little child a walk. He forgets the legs are little and the child tires itself trying to keep step, and has to trot often to keep up. I never was allowed to set the marching pace in France because I walked too fast, forgetting how far we had to go and what burdens the men had to carry. But our Captain doesn't forget, and He knows our burdens. We will never fall out by the way if we walk with Jesus.

The real secret of keeping rank and step is that we have all a great purpose. Those men in the Book of Chronicles kept rank with a perfect heart

because they all came determined to make David king over Israel. Their feet were right because their march was right.

Now we have a purpose greater than that; it is to make Jesus King over the whole world. We must get together for that, pray together, pull together, march in step. You can't be a Christian in your own corner, you must 'fall in,' so that it shall be true what we sing:

Like a mighty army, moves the Church of God.

Why is Jesus not yet King over all the world? It is because Christians have not yet learned to 'keep rank with a perfect heart.' The Churches are all at sixes and sevens. They are a shuffling mob, when they should be a mighty marching army, tramping with magnificent unison and ordered ranks to a great end.

Therefore, boys and girls, get into step with Jesus and 'fall in' in the ranks of those who would crown Him King over all, forgetting yourself and keeping rank with a perfect heart.

A Bad Spill.¹

'Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.'—1 Co 10¹².

The other day I read a horrible thing, as bad as a nightmare when you waken up screaming, and mother comes running upstairs, and you can't tell her what is wrong, only that you have had an ugly dream, and are afraid of something. In some places in the Balkans, so it seems, there are packs of wolves prowling about and hunting where no wolves have been seen for long enough. There are so many of them, that in certain districts the people daren't stay on the farms, for it's not safe; they are flying into the towns, and they are not always reaching them. For sometimes these swift awful beasts come nearer and nearer and at last pull them down, and they have a fearful end there in the centre of that snapping and flashing of white teeth! But the most shocking thing of all is that the dogs have turned against their masters! Not all of them of course. Many, when that grim avalanche of hungry brutes bursts in, go down fighting bravely to the last. But quite a lot of dogs have become wild again, have gone back to the wolf packs, do what they do, go where they go, hunt what they hunt, yes, sometimes men and women. For always it is the wolves that lead,

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

never the dogs that teach these savage creatures their own better ways. Isn't there something dreadful about that? For dogs and men have been close chums so very long. It must be thousands and thousands of years! They are so loyal, these old friends of ours, that you and I would think that they couldn't be anything else now, that it's grown to be an instinct, a bit of themselves; that just as, so long as the eye is there, we'll see, because that is what an eye is for, so, as long as a dog is a dog, it will be loyal, for that is its way: and yet yonder they've gone wild again, and turned against their masters! Why, it's only a year or two since some of them were soft round fluffy balls of puppies, and were being fed and fondled and played with by the children of the house! And now they're hunting with the wolves; and when men and women and little ones are overtaken and pulled down, there are the dogs too at the heart of it, grown wild and savage again after all these thousands and thousands and thousands of years! So you and I must be very careful even where we look quite safe. Though we have done well for a long long time, still we must be upon our guard; though we haven't much of a temper, are good-humoured and cheery enough, can take knocks and not get angry, and lose the game without being grumpy, still let us take care, for ugly things that no one knew were there may blaze out any moment and quite suddenly. Look at the Balkan dogs turned, almost in a minute, into murderous dreadful beasts, the very dogs that were petted and loved, were faithful and affectionate, whom everybody trusted! Life is like a game of golf. Do you play golf? You may be doing splendidly, may be at the top of your form; everything may be coming off, and every time; your long putts are going down, and your drives are clean and straight; and those watching you win hole on hole think the game is over and settled. And yet quite suddenly something may go wrong. You seemed steady and set, and yet all in a moment you go to pieces; can do nothing right; you find every bunker, you keep pulling into the rough, and once and again and yet again your ball lies on the edge of the hole, another inch would have made all the difference; the match was won, and then you throw it away. So it is with other things. You begin the new session splendidly, work hard, do well, sit up near the top, and then somehow you tire, and grow careless, can't be bothered, go tumbling

down the benches, end up quite near the bottom, you who began so well go wild like the Balkan dogs.

One of the bravest men I ever knew, who had been out at the front for four years, and done marvellous things time and again, was court-martialled in the end. Quite suddenly one day his nerves gave. He himself didn't know how; and no one else supposed that he had any nerves, so brave and bold was he. And yet, after his glorious record, one day he broke down. And you're a fine wee chap, you come of a good stock, and you are clean and true, would never stoop to soil yourself with anything nasty and ugly. That's fine; and yet you take care! The straightest and manliest and whitest boy in my class hadn't left school three years when he was fleeing the country with the police after him for a grave crime, the very boy who had been a conscience to us all, and before whom we would have been ashamed not to have played the game! Dogs can go wild, you see, can take to hunting with the wolves. Edinburgh Castle was captured, not where the road slopes to it, but by clambering up the high jagged rocks that are so steep that the men holding it were sure that nobody could come that way, so sure that, as the little band were crawling up, clinging with hands and feet and the curves of their bodies, a soldier on the battlements cried out in his English voice, 'I see you!' and sent a great rock leaping down, that just missed them, skipping an inch or two above their heads. And they thought, holding their breath, we are discovered! But no! A moment or two, and then there came his laugh as he chaffed his fellows, who had come running out at the alarm, 'I got you that time, silly fools, for who could come up rocks like these?' Yet in ten minutes it was done, and the great castle fell, fell where it was safest. And in the big war Germany was beaten just where she was strongest. It was the British who were set against the Hindenburg Line, with its masses of barbed wire, and trenches, and guns, and fortifications of all kinds, and it was freely said that they couldn't get through, that the best that they could do was to hold up as many Germans as possible, in order that the French in the south might move a bit, and that the Americans with a much softer job might break right in. And yet it was the British who burst through. The Germans fell where they were strongest, where they were quite sure they couldn't fall. And so

we must be careful, you and I, even when we are doing well. Not that we need get scared; there is never any sense in that. Only we must be on our guard even where things look safe, and must keep always close to Jesus Christ, and not begin to think that we don't need Him and can do without Him, that there is no real fear for us. Think of the dogs! Beside Him nobody need ever be afraid of anything at all. I knew a captain at the front, who came home without any medals, yet who was so very brave that dozens of men told me that when things were very hot if he were there they never felt uneasy, would have been ashamed to be nervy and frightened beside one so cool and calm and big of heart; that often and often the sight of him rallied them and kept them going. That's what Christ does for us. Keep near Him, and you'll never feel afraid, will pull yourselves together every time, and keep going straight.

The Christian Year.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Centrality of Jesus Christ.

BY THE REVEREND FREDERIC C. SPURR.¹

'And I saw in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain, having seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God, sent forth into all the earth.'—Rev 5^o.

The book of the Apocalypse, for many religious people, is under a cloud to-day. By a certain few it is almost despised, as if it were a jumble of incoherent images—the product of a strange and disordered fancy. By far more it is avoided, as if it were an intricate set of symbols, the explanation of which is for ever beyond us. Whatever be the cause or causes of this indifference or suspicion, the fact itself is deeply to be regretted. For there is no book in the whole Bible which is richer in spiritual meanings, and fuller of practical significance for our own time than this book. Let us admit freely that some of its fine details are still enveloped in a concealing mist, that certain of its symbols do not easily yield their meaning, and that it is necessary to leave a wide margin for secondary interpretations; but after all this, there yet remains, in clear and splendid relief, the one great central truth of the book to which all the symbols are bound, and of which they are the

¹ C.W.P. ciii. 282.

expression. This truth is fundamental for Christianity. It is the truth of the centrality of our Lord Jesus Christ in the whole scheme of things, and of His absolute Lordship over the life of man and of the world.

The problem of the book of the Apocalypse is a very simple one. It is this: shall the Lamb—that is the Divine Lord who gave Himself in sacrifice for the redemption of the world, or the beast—the world-power of the day, materialistic and often devilish—rule over the life of man? The Lamb and the Beast! these are the two central figures of the book. The gentle and Divine power of the One and the brutal and the demoniac power of the other are set in vivid contrast in a series of symbolic images. The war between the two is depicted, and at the end the beast is seen for ever vanquished—his flesh given to the vultures—while the Lamb is upon the throne, King of kings and Lord of lords. There was no doubt in the mind of St. John as to who should and who shall finally rule the world. The problem of the book of the Apocalypse is our problem too.

The methods of the beast have been modified by the power of civilization, but the aim of the beast remains the same. What is to be the issue of the conflict? Why is it that to-day the Church in place of overcoming the world, has been largely overcome by it; overcome by its speculations, its spirit, its rationalism, its cynicism, its agnosticism, its materialism?

I. Human *pride* to-day bitterly opposes the central faith by which the Church lives. It has no place for the idea of a Divine sacrifice on behalf of human redemption.

From the beginning the cross has been an offence to the proud man. It offends his dignity, and he professes that it outrages his ethical sense. But what if his dignity be false and his ethical sense be deflected?

Whenever pride has run high in any given epoch, there men have made a mock of sin and have treated with lightness or contempt the Divine sacrifice offered on behalf of human salvation. But where pride has been abased, and the stark realities of human life have compelled repentance, then men have returned, humbly and with beating of the breast, to the cross. This is the inner story of every great religious awakening, and the persistence of the phenomenon throughout the ages is a proof that here we are in the presence of a law of life.

If history has anything to teach us it is this, that when the sense of sin has disappeared or become weakened in any community, then the cross of Christ has vanished into the mist. Men having no consciousness of sickness think nothing of the physician. But, on the contrary, when the sense of sin is real, then men recognize that in the cross lies their one hope. And is there anything more calculated to awaken the sense of sin than the true preaching of the cross? The sense of sin and the cross act and react upon each other. The one calls for the other. The penitent sinner cries for the Redeemer. The Redeemer, shown upon the cross, creates penitence in the sinner.

Pride, I have said, opposes the faith by which the Church lives. But where should pride be to-day?

In the easy days before the war there was widespread revolt against the idea of a Divine man immolated for the sins of the world. The atonement was even said to be immoral. And the very epoch which turned from the cross and expressed its disgust with the thought of blood shed for human redemption has been compelled to watch the soil soaked to repletion with the blood of martyred youth, which now it glorifies, and to the memory of which it raises cenotaphs and monuments. The world has had enough to abase its pride, yet still it refuses to admit its sin and to cry to God for mercy. Until it abases itself and kneels, in humble penitence, before Him whom it has re-crucified, there can be no healing of its wound, nor prosperity for its soul, nor progress for its feet.

2. In our time, too, faith in material *force* has become a religion. The force of money by which alone pure pleasure is supposed to be procured, true place guaranteed, and overwhelming success achieved. The force of spectacle through which man, victimized by the passing show, is prevented from reflecting upon the things which pertain unto his peace. The force of institutions, the imposing splendour of which silences the conscience and creates moral cowardice. The force of arms by which peoples are held in subjection and when misunderstandings arise are subjected to the hellish cruelties of war.

Men may disguise it as they will, and seek for the causes of the late war in immoral diplomacy, commercial envy, unprincipled journalism, and unnatural greed; the fact remains that the radical cause of the disaster which in 1914 overtook the

world is to be found in the deliberate repudiation by mankind of the Lamb of God as its only true ruler, and the enthronement in His place of the beast. Does the world now believe this? Does it see its colossal error and sin? Is it cured of its fatal trust in force? Let the present state of Europe and the increase in armaments in nearly all civilized countries supply the answer. In every place, God be thanked, there are deep stirrings of conscience and a growing uneasiness concerning the whole matter. The Churches are speaking with no uncertain sound. But the world as a whole has learned little from its bitter experience. The beast is still the popular idol. Must there be another hell let loose before mankind will return to its senses, and offer its sole worship to the Lamb of God?

3. What is the great business of the Church of God in this critical hour of human life? The Church is Christ's body, the medium through which the Living Head expresses Himself in the world. The Church is meant to be vocal for Him, and active for Him. It is His witness to mankind. It has no other *raison d'être* than this. When it degenerates into a club, or an entertainment society, or a company of religious formalists, it suffers degradation and eclipse and justly earns the contempt of men. Our business is not primarily to formulate a philosophy or a theology—although we are bound to do both—but to bear unceasing witness by lip and in life to the Lamb of God as the Redeemer and the Lord of the world. It is to a Person that we bear witness; One who has appeared in history and to whom historical documents and institutions testify; One who is at work in personal human lives, delivering them from the grip of sin and empowering them for all holy service—the Christ of history and the Christ of experience. The heart of this witness lies in the cross and in the throne; the Christ yielding His life in sacrifice for the sins of the world, and the Christ reigning as the Lamb, by the power of gentleness, love, and holiness; winning by His wounds and not by the sword.

Christians must one and all recover the faded vision of the Seer of Patmos, and behold the Lamb of God as central in sacrifice and central in rulership.

A new and fuller experience of Christ would wipe away all our tears, dismiss all our doubts, and give to us the invincible certitude of the final

victory. There is no hope for the world save in the ancient Gospel as preached and practised by the Church in a new and living way. To this immense task Christ calls us. To His call let us make answer, 'Here am I, send me.'

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Covetousness.

'Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness.'—Lk 12¹⁵.

'What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit his own self?' That is the way Jesus sums up the whole argument between covetousness and love. As always, He is thinking of the great future—or the endless present—of one whom God has made for Himself. What conceivable abundance of things could one gather about himself here for a few years, that would counter-balance in its satisfactions the blank loss of himself and his very capacity for joy? Of course, when it is put as Jesus put it, the question is unanswerable. Life is what we all want, and not a pile of heavy baggage that we can carry only half-way on our journey. As Jesus said unanswerably, 'A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.'

1. And yet, while Jesus' argument is for most of us thoroughly unanswerable, how few it has convinced in practice from that far-off day to this! Probably more people are yielding assent to it to-day than ever in the world before, because so many have ceased to be satisfied with conventional religion and are seeking earnestly to know what Jesus Himself really wanted men to do. The traditional religion of the creeds yields at best a rather dubious sociological programme; but the religion of Jesus goes straight as an arrow to its mark in fundamental social questions. He lived a life, and taught a life, that gives covetousness hardly a foothold in human character. His scale of values is such that one who honestly follows after Him is looking in quite a different direction from that of money-making. To be sure, he will have to make money if he is to live; he will have to put energy into his work also; and if he does this he is likely to get ahead in the race. He may even have as his special aim the winning of wealth for the unselfish uses of the Kingdom. But he cannot breathe the same spiritual air as Jesus, or

look out on the same horizons, and yet live for the sake of piling up possessions, especially at the expense of others. The spirit of his Master and of his Father is in him, and what that spirit is, the life and death of Jesus clearly show.

2. Now the world of to-day is groping in almost an agony of desire for anything that can really overthrow the power of greed and envy and suspicion. There is no hope in autocratic militarism; there is just as little hope at the opposite end of the scale in anarchistic socialism. Both lead to chaos and death. The people of China, as much as those of Russia or Austria, are just now in the acutest need of some power that can make justice and benevolence actually triumphant in the State, and France and America and Italy also can find their ultimate social salvation only in deliverance from the cruel covetousness of men, whether bourgeois or proletarian.

3. Jesus alone opens this door of hope to mankind, not only because He gave Himself unreservedly to the glorious ministry of love, but because He dedicates all His followers—all the men and women and children who should ever hear His words and do them—to the same life of obedience to their Father's will. He does not suddenly make them all saints, because we are what we are, intractable stuff at best for Divine uses, but He opens their eyes at once to a new range of values and a new standard of ambitions.¹

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Light of the World.

'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'—Jn 8¹².

It was the time of the feast of Tabernacles when the Jews erected tents or tabernacles along the sides of the Mount of Olives, and lived in them during the whole week of the feast, in memory of their fathers' way of living during the wilderness journey. Every night the Jews assembled in great numbers in the Temple Courts, and as it grew dark the priests were accustomed to light a great lamp that stood there. They say that its light could be seen all over Jerusalem. This lamp was intended to remind them of the pillar of fire that led their

¹ H. Kingman, *Building on Rock*, 122.

fathers through the wilderness. But on the last night of the feast the priests did not light the lamp, for they wished to remind the people that their great Messiah, the promised light of the world, had not yet come. So now it was the last night of the feast; the people were assembled in the Temple Courts; darkness began to fall; but the priests did not light the lamp. Then Jesus rose in the midst of them, and as they turned to look at Him, He lifted up His hand, and cried, 'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'

1. This is one of the sayings of our Lord which prove that 'never man spake as this man'. There are only two ways you can receive it. You can either regard it as the wildest words of audacity and self-deluded egotism that human lips ever uttered, or you must bow your knees in worship before the very utterance of God Himself. There is no middle course possible. When Christ was upon the earth people frequently put the question, 'Who then is this?' They asked it when He stilled the storm on the lake. And sometimes they answered the question themselves, 'Is not this the carpenter's son, Jesus of Nazareth?' And this is always one way of answering the question. He is a man like ourselves. He is a great ethical teacher of exceptional ability and uprightness of life. It is such an easy answer. It demands so little from us, except our admiration. But it is no use for a text such as ours.

Of course we need the humanity of Christ as well as His Divinity. We love to think that He understood our difficulties and shared our sorrows.

I love to think upon Thy dust-stained feet
That ached and hardened with the stony road
And craved relief from parch of noon-day heat
In each cool stream that by the wayside flowed.

I love to think upon Thy humanness
That welcomed sundown and the close of day,
Which left Thee free for just a little space
To climb the hill and sit and think and pray.

Sympathy we need, and the sympathy of the Son of Man is a thing we cannot do without. But of what value is it to us without His saving power? The carpenter of Nazareth who is simply one of ourselves cannot help those who are tempted, neither can He give the weary rest. But the Son of God can. There is no middle course then, God or man.

2. He called Himself the light of the world. What exactly did He mean by that?

Well, what is it that light does? Obviously the first thing that it does is *to let us see*. When we go into a dark room we see nothing at all, but when we turn on the light we see whatever the room contains. This world contains God. But no man hath seen God at any time. No! but Jesus Christ came into the world to show us God.

He lets us see God first of all by simply letting us see Himself. 'I and the Father are one,' He says, and therefore when we see Him we see God. We see that He is a God of holiness to whom sin, evil, is the one hateful thing; but we see also that he is a God of Love. God so loved the world that He gave His only Son. The Hebrew prophets saw most clearly the holiness of God—a jealous God visiting the iniquity of the Fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation. In Isaiah's great vision he saw the seraphim surrounding the throne of God, and crying, Holy, Holy, Holy, and the effect was to make him feel his own sinfulness. But when we turn to Christ we see this same God of the majesty of holiness taking the little children in His arms and blessing them. 'He is of purer eyes than to behold evil,' and yet at the same time, 'Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him.'

But light serves another purpose besides letting us see. It *guides us*. The lights at the mouth of a harbour are not intended to drive away the darkness round them. They are meant to guide the ships into the harbour.

Now when Jesus spoke of Himself as the light of the world He meant most of all that He was a guiding light, for He adds, 'He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness.'

In what sense is Christ a guiding light to men and women in this world? He is a guiding light because He is our example. He lived a human life on earth; He went about continually doing good, and He left us an example, as the apostles say, that we should follow in His steps. Now notice that He is a *living* example. In the Old Testament times the prophets came with their precepts, and no doubt they taught the people how to avoid evil and do good: but after the prophets came the Son.

The Word had flesh and wrought
With human hands the creed of creeds
In loveliness of perfect deeds.

And how much better the living example is than the spoken word.

But Christ speaks as if He were a guide in the present, a guide to every one who comes into the world, at whatever time He comes. 'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness.'

What a sinister sound there is about the phrase 'the powers of darkness.' There is something about the darkness that binds the reason, as it were, and lets loose the imagination. The child mind and the savage mind, which are so closely related, are re-awakened in us, and we are not quite the same person at midnight as at midday.

But the real powers of darkness lurk in the world of the spirit. There is a darkness of ignorance, a darkness of impurity, a darkness of sorrow, and a darkness of death. It is this darkness that Christ comes as the light of the world to dispel. And He does it not merely by acting as an outward example to us, but by entering within our life itself as an inward guide. He is our guide as an inner impulse, an inward presence. There is nothing about which the Apostle Paul is more emphatic than this, that he has received the gift of the Holy Spirit, and he explains quite clearly that by the Holy Spirit he means Christ Himself as a spiritual presence within us. 'I live,' he says, 'yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' 'He that followeth me shall have the light of life.' It is the presence of Christ Himself, a spiritual presence, and He goes with us all the way, even unto death. Is it unnecessary to touch upon death? He claims that to those who are in Him the night shineth even as the day. He lights up the darkness by the gracious light of His companionship. 'I will be with thee.' When we are in good company how the time flies! The hours slip away and we are surprised when the time of separation comes. And so it is to the Christian in death. The company and the fellowship are so good that the season is past before we know it.

'I think,' says Dr. Jowett in one of his books, 'I think the Christian's first wondering question on the other side will be, "Am I really through?"' Really? 'Even the night shall be light about thee.' It matters not how stormy the night may be, the Light of Life shall never be blown out. 'At eventide it shall be light.'

What about the morrow? When the river is crossed, is there any light upon the regions beyond?

We have Christ's promise that the same light which has been with us along the whole way will shine upon us in our new country. 'The Lord God is the light thereof.'

On the banks of the river Ganges in India crowds of people are to be seen at certain seasons of the year launching little boats on the stream with a light in every one of them. When you ask what is the meaning of it, they tell you that those who have gone before into the other world are in darkness and they are sending down these lights to them to lighten their darkness. But they who have gone to be with Christ need no candle, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light, and the Lamb is the Light thereof.

--- TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Cæsar and God.

'Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's.'—Mt 22²¹.

Few texts have been more misused than this one. Mr. Phillips Oppenheim in a recent novel makes one of his characters say, 'There was just one chapter of the Bible which Uncle Benjamin used to shove down our throats, which seemed to me to have some common sense in it. "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's" came in it. I call that sound philosophy. Sooner or later you'll find out that so long as you are of this world you must live as though you are.' He leaves the second part of the text out of sight, and this is by no means uncommon.

But there are less obvious ways of misusing the text. As an isolated motto this verse has been used to sanction a false spirituality utterly obnoxious to the spirit of Jesus. It has been used to support that point of view which shuts human life up into water-tight compartments, having no relations one with another, which says this is secular, that is sacred; this is politics, that is religion; this is business, that is morality; and which is prepared to use two differing codes of conduct for those respective activities. 'Nothing was further,' said Loisy, 'from Jesus' thoughts than to establish a principle in accordance with which the boundaries of the domains of God and those of Cæsar might be rigidly defined.'

If Jesus did not mean that a separation of the

things of Cæsar from those of God is permitted, what did He mean?

A careful inquiry into the context of this saying will show that the generally accepted idea, that Jesus here permits a separation of the things of Cæsar from those of God, is actually the reverse of the truth. The Pharisees and Herodians each took opposite views of what the relation of the Jews should be to the Roman power. The Herodians were prepared to accept the compromise of Roman rule through some representative of the house of Herod. They indulged a veiled opposition both to the Roman procuratorship and to the more distinctive Jewish ideal of a pure theocracy. They were willing to compromise their national ideal for political aims. The Pharisees, on the other hand, professed to believe in theocracy. Israel's only King was Jehovah, Cæsar was a usurper. They paid much lip-homage to this idea, yet they did not openly raise the standard of revolt, but bore themselves submissively to their oppressors, and were nothing loath to use Cæsar's coinage and benefit by other advantages of Roman rule. Neither party occupied a frank, honest position. Their position, already dishonest, was doubly false as they approached Jesus. They sought no genuine solution of their national difficulty; they did not mind being left to their own opinions so long as they could induce Jesus to commit Himself.

What precisely did Jesus mean, then, when He said, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.' The word translated 'render' is a word meaning simply 'give back,' 'restore,' and, as such, is applicable to the idea of paying tribute. If, however, it was clear that Jesus meant 'pay tribute' by the words, it is highly singular that the Pharisees did not seize upon His sanction and hold Him up to the displeasure of the multitude. Instead, we find the Pharisees silent and the people delighted. Why? Because the Pharisees could not tell what He meant, whereas the people seized on the simplest significance of the words and understood Jesus to mean—'Give back to Cæsar all that is Cæsar's!' 'Give it back to him! Refuse to have anything to do with Cæsar! Don't soil your hands and honesty by using his coinage at all! Refuse to touch it! Give back to Cæsar whatever is Cæsar's!' They had just confessed that it was Cæsar's coinage. Bearing his image it was the symbol of their subjection. Yet they were secretly his foes. Christ's reply, whilst its form was one with which they

could find no fault, might just as well have meant 'Fling back to Cæsar these symbols of his oppression and of your dependence.'

'And unto God, the things that are God's.' Probably the Pharisees and Herodians might have stopped to ask Jesus what precisely He meant by 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's' if it had not been for this second sentence, which must have fallen from the lips of Jesus at a white-heat of moral indignation. One can see the form of Jesus dilating terribly in moral passion whilst He spoke these words, as when He hurled out of the Temple them that sold therein.

There is no doubt here, either for Pharisees or people, as to His meaning. Nor for us. He means that if only they had been right with God there would never have been any doubt in their minds regarding their duty to Cæsar. Their difficulty arises solely from their falsity to God and His moral law. Their duty is to be simply genuine and honest whether they pay tribute or do not. If they render unto God His dues they will not fail in their duty to Cæsar, whether that duty be to oppose him or to serve him. As Paul put it at a later time, 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.' So that we see emerging from the story, not the lesson of the separateness of the things of Cæsar and the things of God, but the lesson of their solemn and close relation.

By the phrase 'things of Cæsar' more, of course, can be meant than simply the coinage that bears Cæsar's superscription. All affairs of State, of commerce, of the home, of international politics; all those interests that we so commonly and yet mistakenly speak of as secular and temporal. These things can never be rightly adjusted to the soul, until the soul is right with God.

There is nothing more obvious about the teaching of our Lord than that He saw life as a grand whole—all of a piece, a delicate mosaic of inter-relations, a closely woven network of mutual dependencies. For Him there were no things that were not God's. He denied most strenuously the possibility of our being able to serve God and Mammon, or of being able to pursue one code of morality in dealing with men and another in dealing with God. On the contrary, He taught that the soul's divine opportunity of serving God was to be found in the right use of the daily and commonplace things of life.

The final judgment of God upon our conduct will not fall upon our observance of the Lord's day, or of the forms of worship, but upon such things 'of Cæsar' as the distribution of our food to the hungry, our clothes to the ill-clad, our practical sympathy to the outcast and the criminal. What could be more common than water? Turned on from a tap, so many shillings a quarter! How prosaic!

Yet the giving of a cup of water may bring a soul into the holy service of God.

Jesus is insistent that we cannot sustain right relations with our earthly environment unless we seek God first. 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these other things shall be added unto you.'¹

¹ A. D. Belden, *Does God Really Care?*, 22.

Jeremiah and Jesus—in Comparison and Contrast.

BY THE REVEREND H. A. WILLIAMSON, B.D., LOCHEE.

II.

WHILE we are impressed by Jeremiah's anticipations of Christianity in his handling of the Law, we are conscious of yet greater differences, when we look at the subject from another angle. A candid student of the Jeremianic oracles must confess to a feeling of relief, when he turns from them to the Gospels. Jeremiah's world is a very unhappy, unsettled world. Convulsions shake the nations; there is 'terror on every side.' The people mock at Jeremiah's stock-phrase—מְנוּרָה מִכְּבִּיב. There are plottings and counter-plottings among the Powers. It was in fact a kind of situation resembling the condition of Europe prior to the Great War. Apparently the little State of Judah is in a ferment; its political leaders fail to read the signs of the times. Jeremiah presents us with a dark picture of social corruption. Unheeding of every danger, the king Jehoiakim is building a spacious palace (Jer 22^{13ff.}). Jeremiah brings a scathing charge against him of employing forced labour without any remuneration. This glimpse into court-life explains the social tyranny of the times, and the utter disregard for the rights of the poor. Jehoiakim's panelled and painted palace, founded on injustice, reveals the corruption of Judah, and justifies the prophet's diatribes against the 'shepherds' of his country. While the king was indulging in selfish luxury and vulgar ostentation, the enemy from the North was polishing his spear.

The people themselves had grown sceptical. Josiah's reformation had not effectively cured their idolatrous tendencies. Yahweh might be worshipped in name, but the cult was really that of

Baal. The names had been changed; that was all. Foreign influences had made it possible to pay tribute to foreign gods. The protest of the exiles in Egypt against Jeremiah's Puritanism throws a light on their spiritual condition. They still profess to recognize Yahweh, and at the same time affirm their decision to sacrifice to other gods. In defence of their conduct they appeal to the old practices in Judah, stating in defiance of Jeremiah's exhortations that they had then enjoyed plenty of food and saw no evil (Jer 44). This incident is sufficient proof of the religious temper of the nation before its downfall. Yahweh had come to be merely the greatest god in their pantheon. In consequence of this was the 'induration of heart,' so bitterly complained of by the prophet. The preacher of a stern self-discipline and lofty spirituality had a well-nigh hopeless task. The fruitlessness of his preaching left him the prey of despondency. Now he sides with God in exacting penitence or doom; now he ranges himself on the side of his people in sorrow at their fate. He is driven to and fro between his moral convictions and his human love. He never manages quite to reconcile the two. The resultant is a *sense of strain in his piety*. He is not an easy-going optimist, singing, 'All's well with the world.' He never indeed loses hope of ultimate issues, because he believes in the power of God. It might be nearer the mark to say that he almost despairs of man. In estimating either his optimism or pessimism, we have to bear in mind the nature of his age and work. We must also think of a highly sensitive, shrinking disposition, faced with a hard task, a task so disagreeable and thankless that 'melancholy marked him for its own.'

Both Jeremiah and Jesus are types of life which fulfil the portrait of the Suffering Servant in Is 53. But in Christ we see no traces of melancholy. We marvel at His strength, at His sunny confidence, and at His consciousness of victory. Can we discover the cause of this difference? It lies primarily in their different conceptions of God. Jeremiah lays emphasis on the sovereign will of Yahweh, while our Lord puts first the Fatherhood of God. Jeremiah can indeed speak of God as Father, but it is not in that intimate personal sense used by Christ. At most Yahweh is father of the nation (cf. Jer 3¹⁹); and, though the prophet uses the term, it has never its full significance in his life. What really awes him is Divine Sovereignty, to be exercised in righteous acts. That God is a king delighting in clemency he freely admits. 'I am Yahweh, which exercise loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth; for in these things I delight.' Nevertheless, the impenitence of Israel brought out the sterner aspects of God. Jeremiah's visions are those of a wrathful Sovereign, who is compelled by men's sin to restrain his mercy. Such an experience, working on a sensitive mind, produced moods of gloom. An impression of sternness is left on his soul. There is a severe strain in his piety. He accepts the will of God, but makes little pretence to gladness. He has to gird himself for the effort. In some ways Jeremiah resembles the Puritans; and their theology is not dissimilar, for it springs from elevating Divine Sovereignty over the other attributes of God. Duty, and not love, is the master-power. God is the task-master under whose eye duty must be done. Cost what it may, the will of God has to be carried out. Sometimes we are conscious that in Jeremiah the Stoic is more pronounced than the Saint. In his worst moods he breaks out in 'wild whirling words' like Job, or mourns over the burden and mystery of this unintelligible world. We are drawn to Jeremiah by his very humanity, and by his Jacob-like wrestlings with the unseen Adversary, who always proved too powerful for him (Jer 12^{1f}). But in his views of God's nature he belongs to the OT.

Now the conception of Jesus was one which left no room for the severity and self-repression of Jeremiah. God was not dethroned, as the expression 'the kingdom of God' shows. But somehow we are led directly into the presence of the Heavenly Father as individuals. We are first conscious of this individual relationship, and only afterwards

we come to realize that we belong to a kingdom as well. We are more fully aware of fatherhood than of kingship. 'It is in the name Father, as expressive of a special loving and gracious relation to the individual members of His kingdom, that Christ's doctrine of God specially sums itself up,' writes the late Dr. James Orr in *The Christian View of God and the World*. Consequently in Christ's own relation with God we find no sense of strain. Jesus had His hours of agony; but there is never any remonstrance against His Father's will. His life conveys to us a sense of liberty and peace, and happiness in doing His appointed work. He is conscious of oneness with God, and, while the flesh shrinks from the Cross, the spirit accepts it for the joy of ultimate victory. The intense agony of Gethsemane is not a challenge of the Father's will, so much as the mental struggle which every son of man passes through at the thought of suffering. There is no clash of wills as in Jeremiah, in whom, as Dr. A. B. Davidson has said, 'Israel struggled against its doom.'

The strain of pessimism, or rather puritanical severity, appears in three directions in Jeremiah's life. (1) First, *he is afflicted with a kind of dual consciousness*. His heart is divided in its allegiance. His zeal for Yahweh has to defend itself against the appeals of patriotism. When we read his indictment against Judah, we must not misconstrue the real love which prompts his speech and activities. He is keenly sensitive to his hard position, and is exceedingly angry when people insinuate that he has a morbid joy in announcing destruction (Jer 17¹⁶). This duality of consciousness appears in his remarkable 'Confessions.' We are introduced to the inner workings of his mind. The extraordinary thing is that he thought fit to record these soul-debates. In them he reveals, as no other prophet does, his self-communings and self-questionings. He utters passionate and unavailing protests against his hard fate. Yahweh drives him on; and how can a mere mortal escape His power? The poem in 20⁷⁻¹³ is bold almost to irreverence. He has been made a prophet, partly by guileful promises, and partly by overpowering compulsion. He is forced to speak out, because 'the word' burns like fire in his bones; and, when he speaks out, he is met with contumely and persecution. His only hope is that Yahweh will avenge him of his adversaries.

The cry of anguish reaches its height in the

succeeding oracle (20¹⁴⁻¹⁸), where he curses the day of his birth as heartily, if not so picturesquely, as Job. These confessional poems of Jeremiah have certain points of resemblance to the great drama of Job; and naturally so, because they both deal with the problem of suffering.

The two poems quoted are evidence enough of Jeremiah's divided heart. The rebellious mutterings are quenched; but we are left with the impression of a man to whom duty is paramount, yet to whom duty is the 'stern daughter of the voice of God.' He faces his task because he must, not because he may. The will of the subject has at all costs to be brought into subjection to the will of the Sovereign. The self-consciousness of Jesus, on the contrary, reveals no trace of duality. He is saved from being plunged into the depths of despair, because He walks in the light of love. This love shows itself unconquerable on the Cross, when He prays, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' Love is so triumphant that it puts in a plea for mercy on behalf of His enemies.

(2) Moreover, *Jeremiah's stern piety is reflected in his social relationships.* In obedience to what he conceives to be his mission, he withdraws from ordinary life. It is borne in upon him that he is not free to have a home of his own. We must not read into this any ascetic tendency on the part of the prophet. His motive is not that of a 'higher life.' He remains unmarried, because the day of wrath is about to break. For a similar reason he refuses to enter the houses of merrymakers or mourners (Jer 16¹⁻⁹). Thus he obtains no relief from his spiritual tension, and in his own person he becomes the embodiment of his mission. It is possible that St. Paul took his opinion on the marriage question from Jeremiah, seeing that the apostle looked forward to an immediate *παροισία*. It is somewhat unfortunate that what was a matter of expediency has become converted into a principle. The celibate life as an ideal is foreign to both Judaism and Christianity. One cannot help thinking that the isolation of the prophet, and the stern repression of his natural feelings, narrowed his views. Certainly they left him a prey to despondency. The recluse does not see life wholly and sanely. It is hardly necessary to point out the different impression we receive of our Lord, moving among the people, and sharing common joys and sorrows. His energies are spent in social activities. He has no time left for brooding, and letting any *βίζα πικρίας*

grow up in His soul. His seasons of withdrawal from men are brief; besides they are hours of fellowship with the Father, so that His strength should be renewed. Peter sums up the gracious nature of Christ's social service to the centurion Cornelius, 'how that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil.' This discloses a radical difference in Christ's attitude from that of Jeremiah. To the prophet the world in which he stood was to be reduced to chaos; any effort at saving it had become hopeless. Jesus, on the other hand, worked on the basis of the world's salvability through the love of God.

(3) Hence *Jeremiah appears to us to overstate the effects of sin and judgment on the world.* At times he despairs of discovering a single honest man in the capital, and promises that, if even one be found who acts honourably, Yahweh will revoke His purpose of doom (Jer 5¹). This is paralleled by his picture of judgment in 4²³⁻²⁸. Utter chaos has come on the earth again. The earth is once more like the primeval waste—*יְהִי עָרְוָה*—through the fierce wrath of God. At the back of Jeremiah's mind there lies, of course, the seed-thought of a fresh creation, but at the moment the vision of judgment thrusts it into obscurity. Sin has so depraved man's nature that repentance has become well-nigh impossible. As soon will the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard its spots, as Israel will seek for penitence. In truth the prophet's pessimistic account makes us wonder how he is going to get the world back from chaos into light and order. He leaves little room for a new start. This, however, presents him with no difficulty. All things are possible with God. By a *tour de force* the New Society emerges from the ruins of the old. The Divine Potter creates another vessel, as He wills. Thus Jeremiah is no real pessimist at heart, because he believes in the power of God to redeem; but he presses human failure so far, and the severity of God's judgment to such an extent, that he leaves us with a sense of tragedy. Undeniably this was partly the consequence of his times, yet also it must be chiefly accounted for by his severe conception of Yahweh's Sovereignty. The stern element in his theology kept in repression a naturally sympathetic nature, and gave a morbid tinge to his outlook on life. It developed a Puritan strain in him, which caused him to see the world as through a glass darkly. Nothing good is left

in the nation. He has been appointed the 'Tester,' and has had to name Israel 'Rejected Silver,' for Yahweh has rejected them (Jer 6³⁰).

The prophecies of restoration (some only are Jeremianic) prove that he never abandoned hope, but they amount to a small fraction. They seem to have been for the most part composed immediately before or after the fall of Jerusalem. The prophet was granted this light at evening-tide. He reminds us of Watts' figure of Hope, sitting on the world, with all the harp-strings broken but one. That one Hope will strike in faith. This conception of Watts' suggests Jeremiah's attitude, but not Christ's. The love of God saved Him from any taint of pessimism. By the gates of repentance all may enter into possession of eternal life. There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth. The faithful servants are summoned to share in the 'joy' of their lord. A characteristic exhortation of Jesus is 'Be of good cheer.' St. Paul reflects the Master's mind when he declares 'the kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy

Ghost.' The ethical vocabulary of the gospel is significant, because it reveals the qualities sought in the New Faith. We have a list including love, light, joy, peace, hope, and humility, the greatest of these being love. It is the greatest, because it is the most perfect, expression of the Divine Will. Here lies the profound originality of the Gospel. You can pick out parallels from the OT, but you never have them in the same combination as Jesus. When once you emphasize love, you rob power of its terrors. Jeremiah, great as he was, had not entered into the privilege of joy in a Heavenly Father, which Christ has made possible for the humblest Christian. His gospel is literally a New Creation; for it shifts the centre of gravity in religion and puts a Father on the throne of heaven. To be עֶבֶר יְהוָה and to stand in His Council (Jer 23^{18, 22}) is a high honour, but it is nothing compared with the dignity of Sonship. 'For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father' (Ro 8¹⁵).

Contributions and Comments.

The Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus on Romans ix. 5.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for April I submitted, with reference to the note on this verse by the late Dr. Sanday and Dr. Headlam, that the *Codex Vaticanus* is as far from demanding a full stop after σάρκα as is the *Sinaiticus* or the *Alexandrinus*. I was then fairly confident that the *Ephraemi Rescriptus*, the only other manuscript referred to, would present as little difficulty as the *Vaticanus*; but the evidence proves to be rather more complicated than I had expected. I owe hearty thanks to Père Boudon, S.J., for investigating this passage in the manuscript with great care, and all my information on the subject must be understood to come from him. Indeed, I would give it in his own words, were they not French.

The *Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus* (C), as is well known, is a palimpsest; Père Boudon reports that it is difficult to read on account of the injuries it has suffered, not merely from the lapse of time,

but more especially from the reagent used to bring out the text (*i.e.* the New Testament text, previously deleted to make room for the writings of St. Ephraem). The manuscript is numbered *fonds grec*, 9, in the Bibliothèque National, Paris. Ro 9⁵ is to be found at the bottom of folio 70, *verso*, and concludes the page. Between σάρκα and ὁ ὢν there is a space hardly greater than that between any two consecutive letters, but there is quite clearly a small cross there, without any other sign or symbol.

This small cross is very often found at the end of a verse, nearly always preceded by a point on a level with the middle of the letters, which point the cross often touches (+); so after Ac 1⁵, etc.: without a point at the end of Ac 1¹⁴. Within a verse, writes Père Boudon, it is sometimes over the point, as in Ac 1⁷, after αὐτοῦς, and in Mt 26⁶⁹, after λέγουσα; these are the only examples mentioned by him, and I myself infer that this signifies a lesser stop, the division into actual verses being, of course, unknown till centuries later. Finally,

the cross is also found by itself, as he says, within a verse, as in Ac 1¹¹ (after εἶπεν, and finishing a line), Mt 26⁵⁸ (after ἀρχιερέως), Mt 26⁷³ (after Πέτρος).

Père Boudon's conclusion from the above example is that the small cross, even by itself, is a strong stop (*marque une punctuation forte*) and is equivalent to a colon, and he mentions M. Omont as an authority who agreed with him upon being shown the verse in question and some examples. But Père Boudon thinks it would perhaps be saying too much to regard the cross alone as equivalent to our full stop, and ends with the remark that it is curious to see it used where we should employ inverted commas.

Having to the best of my power made a faithful report, I feel bound to add that I do not as yet feel satisfied that the manuscript offers a sufficient objection to putting a mere comma after σάρκα. The conclusion that the cross is equivalent to a colon is said to be based upon the examples given, and in the four that are strictly parallel it is twice equivalent to our inverted commas, and in the third case (Mt 26⁵⁸) the best editors put a mere comma; Ac 1¹⁴, however, must be admitted as a real difficulty. It remains to be seen whether I can persuade my friend to an exhaustive investigation of the matter. In any case the evidence for the mere comma remains overwhelming.

CUTHBERT LATTEY.]

St. Asaph.

1 Thessalonians ii. 16.

'But the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.'

THE difficulty of this sentence has been long recognized. Unless the word ἐφθασεν (B D¹ ἐφθακεν) is used in an unusual and unnatural sense, the wrath here cannot be the eschatological wrath, which is clearly its meaning in the Apocalypse and in some of the Pauline references, notably two other places in this Epistle (1¹⁰ and 5⁹), for that was always regarded by the Apostle as future. Nor is it clear how any obvious calamity can have been in the Apostle's mind, for the Epistle was written many years before the year 70. Dr. James Moffatt (*Exp. G. T. in loc.*) countenances the suggestion that the words are an early interpolation. That, of course, is always possible, and the fact that they

are almost identical with Test. Levi vi. 11, if anything, perhaps, confirms the suggestion, though Paul himself might easily have read that passage and had it in mind. But Biblical surgery should be employed only as a last resort. Is there nothing in all Paul's words about 'wrath' on the one hand, and those about the Jews on the other, that can cast light on the meaning? It seems to me we can get light from both sides.

On the one hand, a careful study of Ro 1¹⁸⁻³² and a comparison with the Apostle's other mentions of ἡ ὀργή, shows that he thought of the wrath being manifested in two ways: first, with all apocalypticists, as the eschatological wrath; second, as the natural degeneration which is the inevitable consequence of continuance in sin. This is clearly set forth in the latter half of chapter 1. It is noteworthy that all through these verses the Apostle refers more especially to spiritual degeneration, and in the last section (v. 28) gives as the final and worst stage of wrath the ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, a phrase which I take to mean 'a mind incapable of right judgment.'

To Paul, then, the furthest and most terrible manifestation of God's wrath was the inability to judge correctly. Is there evidence that he thought the Jews had reached that terrible stage? There is. The eleventh chapter of Romans has that as its subject. V. 7^b reads, 'the election obtained it, and the rest were hardened (οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν). V. 25^b says that 'a hardening in part hath befallen Israel' (πάρωσις ἀπὸ μέρος τῇ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν). It is to be noted that this means not a partial hardening of all, but in view of v. 7, a complete hardening of some. But a complete hardening is obviously the same thing as 'a mind become incapable of right judgment.' And it is that which Paul in Ro 1²⁸ regards as the ultimate manifestation of wrath in this life. ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος in 1 Th 2¹⁶ is then equivalent to the ἀδόκιμον νοῦν of Ro 1¹⁸, or πάρωσις of Ro 11²⁵.

I can see only one objection to this interpretation. It is, that his readers would not have understood it. To this two answers are possible. (a) Paul does not seem to have been over careful to see that all his statements were understandable by the ordinary mind, as is testified by 2 P 3¹⁶. Probably, like many another ardent and rapid thinker, things he said seemed so evident to him that he could scarcely realize that others failed to follow. (b) The

first readers may have understood his meaning. We have no evidence that in his teaching to the Thessalonians he had not said much that would throw light on the matter. We tend to forget that Paul's greatest work was direct teaching, not writing epistles.

WILLIAM E. WILSON.

Selly Oak, Birmingham.

St. James' Sermon Notes.

LUTHER may have called James' letter an epistle of straw for doctrinal reasons, but it is not very easy to place as a letter. Once you get past the greeting, it is difficult to see how you can call it a letter at all, and there is no ending. Evidently St. James was no letter-writer, though he lived in a letter-writing age; and the Epistle, when you come to read it, is so unlike what you would expect an apostle to write to a group of Christian congregations that the late Dr. Moulton decided it must be addressed to Jews by the only Christian teacher who could hope to be listened to by them! But what if it is not really a letter at all? Look at it as a collection of little sermonettes, or sermon notes, and you feel at once that you are sitting in the synagogue, and hearing the very tones in which the dear old saint addressed his hearers. Can we imagine a situation something like this? Paul's letters are getting to be widely known, and presumably he was not the only letter-writer among the apostles and leaders of his time, even if Peter had not yet written anything that has come down to us. Some one suggests to James—it may even have been Paul himself—that a letter from him would be very much appreciated by the Jewish Christians of the Dispersion, and would help towards the unity of the Church, and the old man agrees to write; but what is he to say? What better than just that which he has been saying Saturday and Sunday in the Jewish and Christian synagogues? for if Paul and Barnabas are invited to preach in Jewish synagogues, how much more must James, the devotee of the law, have been? And so we have bits out of his addresses, some to Jews, some to Christians: on Trials, on Temptation and Sin, on Hearing and Doing, on Respect of Persons and the Royal Law, on Belief and Conduct, on the many subjects he had recently been preaching

about, with even the "My brethren" thrown in, so entirely does he feel himself to be in the atmosphere of the Assembly, Jewish or Christian, where these discourses are first given.

And if this be so, have we not in the Epistle of James an invaluable guide to the homiletics of the early Apostolic age, enabling us actually to be present at a synagogue service and to hear the preacher for ourselves?

J. SINCLAIR STEVENSON.

Irish Mission, Parantij, India.

The Second Chapter of Colossians.

MAY I add a note to the extremely interesting paper by Dr. Rendel Harris in your January issue? Dr. Rendel Harris throws light on a dark place in the Epistle to the Colossians by reading into it a quotation from the 'Clouds' of Aristophanes. The explanation not only clears one passage, but throws light on the whole argument, and on the related Epistle to the Ephesians.

There is, however, another related passage, and that is in the 'Apologia.' Professor Rendel Harris refers to the well-known story of Socrates complaining humorously that Aristophanes had introduced 'one Socrates carried about (in a basket), and saying that he treads on air, along with a lot more foolery.' He does not seem to have noticed that this very word *περιφερόμενος* is used by St. Paul in the correlated passage in Ephesians (4¹⁴), and that the Apostle uses it in an unmistakably metaphorical sense—*περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας*. It had already become fairly clear that the 'basket' was mythical, and now, if St. Paul had the 'Clouds' and the 'Apologia' in his mind, we may take it that for him Socrates said, not that Aristophanes brought him on the stage 'carried about (in a basket),' but that he brought in 'a certain Socrates *rambling* (in his mind), and talking all sorts of nonsense.' This metaphorical use is well supported by other passages in Plato. It is interesting not only as upsetting the traditional translation in the 'Clouds' and the 'Apologia,' but as reinforcing the central argument of Dr. Rendel Harris, that St. Paul had this play and this scene in his mind.

BERNARD G. HALL.

Knutsford.

Dr. Garvie's Book on the Fourth Gospel.

WITH Mr. F. Warburton Lewis I am grateful to Dr. Garvie for his new book on the Fourth Gospel. He recognizes its great value for the faith of the Church. He has shown, what the whole experience of the Church endorses, that the Fourth Gospel is not shrouded in the grave-clothes of drama and the atmosphere of speculation, but pulsates with life and reality. It is a great service.

Mr. Lewis complains that Dr. Garvie has not read *The Interpreter*. I am at least equally sorry. There was an article in *The Interpreter* of July 1914 dealing with Dr. Garvie's subject. In some respects it anticipated Dr. Garvie's book. It recognized three sources for the Gospel, though not identical with Dr. Garvie's, and they have the advantage of being well known in the Gospels, while Dr. Garvie's are quite unknown; and also in the parallel relationship which he finds between the two chief sources of the Fourth Gospel and the two chief sources of St. Mark's Gospel.

The writer identified Lazarus and the beloved disciple (was it ever done before this?). The theme was as follows: 'Just as Jesus made a special choice of Saul of Tarsus for the interpretation of the Gospel, so He made a special choice of Lazarus for writing that part of it, so imperfectly understood by the Twelve. The relation of Lazarus to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is much the same as that of Mark to Peter in the Second Gospel, only more so, for Lazarus is himself, in this theory, the most important character in the last eleven chapters, and, as it turns out, his experience, as there recorded, has been the special equipment for his work as the writer of the Gospel.'

If Dr. Garvie had read that article, he would not have dismissed the identification of Lazarus with the beloved disciple so easily.

JAMES JONES.

Chelmsford.

Dr. Field's Old Testament Revision Notes.

TRANSCRIBED FROM THE AUTHOR'S MS. BY THE
REV. JOHN HENRY BURN, B.D.

VII.

1 SAMUEL 13¹. [When this passage was about to come up at the third and final revise, Dr. Aldis

Wright wrote to Dr. Field as follows: 'In our marginal note to 1 Sam. 13¹ we have said, "The number *thirty* has been inserted conjecturally," etc. Now it appears to be inserted in "some copies" of the Septuagint. Would it not therefore be better for the note to stand thus: "The number *thirty* has been inserted on the authority of some manuscripts of the Septuagint. In others the whole verse is omitted. The Hebrew text has, *Saul was a year old*"?' To this Dr. Field replied: 'In the marginal note on 1 Sam. 13¹ I think "conjecturally" would probably be understood of the present version, and it would therefore be better to say, "The number *thirty* is only found, probably from conjecture, in a particular revision of the Septuagint, which latter, in its original state, omits the whole verse. The Hebrew is here defective, a numeral having dropped out after *year*."'—A comparison of this with the margin of the RV will show that Dr. Field's note is the clearer as well as the fuller of the two.]

2 SAMUEL 10⁷. Render: 'he sent Joab and all the host, even the mighty men.'

2 SAMUEL 10¹². Should it not be 'play the man,' i.e. the part of a man? I think we never say, 'they played the fools.' [Dr. Aldis Wright, in a letter to the transcriber, maintained that Dr. Field's criticism of the phrase 'play the men' is quite wrong: 'The expression is very common in the writers of the 16th century, and in my *Bible Word Book* I give examples from the English translation of More's *Utopia*, from Holinshed, and from Shakespeare. It occurs in the opening scene of *The Tempest*, and appears to be the regular form when applied to more than one.']

2 SAMUEL 14²⁰. Render: 'To put another face upon the matter,' adding in the margin 'Heb. to turn about the face of the matter.' Cf. 1 Co 4⁶: 'And these things have I transferred in a figure (μετεσχημάτισα) to myself and Apollos,' i.e. I have suppressed the real names, and substituted for them myself and Apollos.

2 SAMUEL 15⁷. 'Four years,' according to the Syriac and Arabic versions, and Lucian's edition of the LXX, with which agrees Josephus (*Antiq.* vii. 9. 1).

2 SAMUEL 17⁹. Retaining AV in the text ('when some of them,' etc.), an alternative might be given in the margin: 'when he (David) falleth upon them.' LXX: ἐν τῷ ἐπιπτεῖν αὐτοῖς ἐν ἀρχῇ. But this would seem to require בַּנְפִּילִי and בָּהֶם for

'some of them' is more idiomatic. So Vulg.: *cum ceciderit unus quilibet in principio*.

2 SAMUEL 18¹³. 'Thou thyself wouldest have stood aloof' is not strong enough. All the versions have: 'taken the contrary part.'

2 SAMUEL 20⁸. Render: 'And Joab was girded with his military cloak as his clothing.'

2 SAMUEL 22⁴³. Render: 'I did grind them and stamp upon them as the mire of the streets.'

Entre Nous.

A TEXT.

Matt. iii. 17.

A 'voice from heaven,' called the 'daughter voice' (Bath Kōl), is often referred to in early Rabbinic literature, and was regarded as one of the vehicles of divine revelation, though later it fell into disrepute. A curious feature characteristic of the Bath Kōl is that its announcement is usually couched in the form of a citation from Scripture (so here). So the heavenly voice is heard at the Baptism, Transfiguration (Mt 17⁵ and parallels), and before the Passion (Jn 12²⁸); so elsewhere in the NT (see art. 'Voice' in Hastings' *DCG*, vol. ii.). Abrahams (*Studies*, §v.) has called attention to the fact that the Heavenly Voice is often represented as piping or chirping as a bird, and suggests that it is this 'association of the bird and the heavenly voice that may underlie the Gospel narrative of the baptism, and at once illustrates and authenticates the symbolism of the Synoptists' (p. 47 f.). However this may be, it seems clear that the source of the comparison of the Holy Spirit to a bird is Gn 1²: 'And the Spirit of God brooded (as a bird) upon the face of the waters'; and in one passage in the Talmud (Chagiga, 15a), Ben Zoma actually makes the comparison to a dove explicit ('the Spirit of God was brooding on the face of the waters like a dove which broods over her young but does not touch them'). Ben Zoma seems to be using a traditional symbolism. If so, the same ideas may underlie the narrative here (note the combination, dove and water).¹

SOME TOPICS.

The Gardener.

Some Living Masters of the Pulpit contains fifteen 'Studies in Religious Personality' (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d.). The studies are by Dr. Fort Newton.

¹ *St. Matthew* in the 'Century Bible,' 96.

On the whole they are very kindly, for Dr. Newton has learned 'to give thanks for what men can do, rejoicing in their gifts without dwelling on their limitations.' In the chapter on William A. Quayle, the Methodist Bishop, Dr. Newton quotes Quayle on John Burroughs.

'All told, as nature writers go, I think John Burroughs the best of all the sweet chorus. . . . But do you read Burroughs' books? What is the lack of them? I will tell you. He has missed the Gardener. Burroughs is apparently an agnostic. I have gone through all his books, seen him walk on his dirt, gone down among the water lilies with him, stopped on the Hudson banks with him, heard the water-brooks bubbling strangely intelligible speech with him, have been all wheres with him, but never saw a hint about the Gardener. If he only once had looked into the Gardener's face and said, "I bless thee, Gardener, that the garden is so sweet," Burroughs would have had no fellow in the earth as an interpreter of the out-of-doors. But in the garden he has missed the Gardener.'

Impropriety.

'One summer when business prevented Dr. Lindsay from coming to Florence, I [Mrs. Ross] went to stay with him in Glasgow. The climate was detestable, but his delightful talk in the cosy studio lined with books, made one forget the cold and wet of an August in Scotland. A solemn-looking man came one day, and seeing that he had something on his mind, I left the room. Afterwards Lindsay told me with some amusement that his visitor was troubled with the sense of impropriety he found early developed in children of tender years. He had been visiting St. Mary's school and began to ask questions in Bible history. "What did Daniel do in the lion's den?" he

enquired. A chubby faced boy of twelve promptly answered, "Please, Sir, he chased Susannah." "In vain," said Lindsay, "I tried to comfort him by saying that 'he chased Susannah' was simply a confused recollection of 'the chaste Susannah'; but he would not be comforted, and told me I was taking serious things too lightly." How we laughed!'¹

Followers.

'I have had a good deal of quiet amusement out of promiscuous ladies who called to enquire about Ellen. I told them how she dusted, how she waited at table, what her special virtues were, what her defects were. You would have laughed had you listened to the conversations and heard my housewifely answers. But we always came to one in which I could see that *my* views were not theirs. "Has she followers?" was a question always solemnly put. My answer was always the same. "I really do not know; but I hope that she has. It must be very dull work, never to see one's friends from one week to another. Surely better to have the opportunity to see them in a nice bright warm kitchen, with everything plain and above-board, than to have stolen interviews in dark—often wet streets." Then the lady bridling would say: "I do not approve of followers," and she would begin to argue the question. But there I was quite ruthless: "Well, well, that is your own look-out. You must make your own arrangements with her yourself." I do not know whether Ellen has gone to a place where followers are or are not allowed. My arrangement with Jessie is simple. "You and the housemaid can see your friends in the kitchen, and I leave it to your honour that everything is as seemly downstairs as upstairs. I do not see why I should have my friends and you should not have yours." I think it works well. It was my dear wife's.'²

NEW POETRY.

Mary E. Boyle.

The first volume which has been sent to us by the Chelsea Publishing Company is a dramatic poem by Mary E. Boyle. The title of it is *Herodias Inconsolable* (3s.).

¹ *Letters of Principal T. M. Lindsay to Janet Ross*, ix.

² *Ibid.*

We note that the head of the firm is a woman, Miss E. Place, and also that she encourages writers to submit MSS. of works on social reform, essays, poetry, and fiction.

Herodias Inconsolable is based on Herod's account of the death of Salome as given in the Syriac Apocrypha. 'For as my daughter, who was dear to me, was playing on a deep pond of water which was frozen over, the ice broke under her, and her whole body went down, and her head was cut off, and remained on the surface of the ice. And lo! Herodias is sitting inconsolable with the head in her lap.'

We quote some lines towards the end of the poem when Herod's remorse finds vent in a wild outpouring to Herodias of the fancies which torment him:

Ah! let me lay my head upon your knees,
A living head, which gazing upward sees
All his heart's country in your downcast face.
Speak to me for my senses play strange tricks.
By day and night I hear the jumbled cries
Of people loud reciting all their sins,
And they who praise God being cleansed of
them.

And folk who argue, muttering angry doubts,
Women who weep, not knowing why their
tears,

Children who wail at having lost their friends.
And over all John's voice proclaiming One
Who should come after, and whose latched shoe,
He—John—would be unworthy to unloose.
Speak to me . . . tell me are you haunted too
By past scenes, chances lost, or are you strong,
So strong you scorn to feel the least remorse?

Rita Francis Mosscockle.

The work of Mrs. Rita Francis Mosscockle has just been re-issued under the title *Collected Poems* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne; 7s. 6d.). The most ambitious pieces in the book are 'The Golden Quest,' a poem of one hundred and twenty-five stanzas, modelled in style and metre on Tennyson's 'Locksley Hall,' and 'Follow Me,' a dramatic poem based on the words in Lk 9²³.

All the poems are not of equal merit, and there

are weak stanzas even in 'The Golden Quest.' We should take as an example the thirty-sixth:

Mind doth never touch the body toucheth not at any point;

Yet the motive power supplieth, fills with oil the empty joint.

But the blemishes are minor. Mrs. Mosscockle is an accomplished versifier, and her poems breathe a sweet and pure devotional spirit.

We quote 'The Sacred Heart':

O Heart to which my heart doth turn
Prostrate with love divine;
In me the sacred fires burn,
O'er me the glories shine.
Hail Sacred Heart which bled that we
May be united unto Thee.

O Heart of hearts what tongue can tell
The wonders Thou hast wrought
In saving us from pains of hell,
By what Thy blood hath bought.
Hail Sacred Heart which bled that we
May be united unto Thee.

O Heart by which I forward reach
To all that speaks of heaven;
Each drop that Thou hast shed doth preach
Of love and sins forgiven.
Hail Sacred Heart which bled that we
May be united unto Thee.

O Heart Divine draw all to see
The beauties of Thy grace;
Till Thy belov'd ones nearer draw
To see Thee face to face.
Hail Sacred Heart which bled that we
May be united unto Thee.

Robert Nicholas Tinkler.

Mr. Basil Blackwell has published *Domine, Quo Vadis?* by Mr. Robert Nicholas Tinkler, M.A.,—'the prize poem on a sacred subject in the University of Oxford, 1923.'

There is considerable vigour in this poem, and

we foresee that we shall hear more of Mr. Tinkler. We quote his lines on those who scan Christ 'with cold material gaze,' dwarfing the God, and leaving in His place an exalted but powerless Man.

But Theologians, flotsam of dead schools,
Cocksure philosophers on three-legged stools,
Weigh up the Godhead in their chemic scales
Till grain or scruple over Christ prevails;

For, scanning Christ with cold material gaze,
They dwarf the God, the Man exalt and praise,
And, reconstructing thus the Fathers' Faith,
Idolaters confessed, adore a wraith;
Oppose to pipings of prepotent Pan,
To Aphrodite's arts, this powerless Man,
And agelong hopes in litany and laud
Proclaim a cruel and colossal fraud.
Wiser than these, though witless in the dark,
Deluded pundits of the Germ and Spark
Recruit the credulous and rapt believe
What spirit-mongers, chartered to deceive,
Profanely mutter, necromancers deep
That conjure voices in theatric sleep
And, foisting earth on Heaven, profoundly link
The New Jerusalem, Cigars, and Drink.

And now let us quote the vigorous ending of the poem:

Take heart, take heart, O Doubting and Dis-
mayed!
The Master's Voice is near: Be not afraid!
Be not afraid, but, like adventurers bold,
Crowd sail for ingots of celestial gold!
Lo, Christ your Commodore the Red Cross flies;
Crowd sail, ye Captains! Splendid is the prize!
Fear not the tempest (fear the wind that fails!),
Nor moan the wreckage of a thousand gales!
Who goes to battle with an Ichabod?
Crowd sail, ye Captains! Pipe all hands for God!

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary com-
munications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.